Essays on Southern Life and Culture

Essays on Southern Life and Culture

A HENDERSON SYMPOSIUM

ISSUED IN COMMEMORATION OF THE SEMICENTENNIAL OF HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
1890-1940

Edited by

A. B. BONDS, JR.

Sometime Julius Rosenwald Fellow at the University of North Carolina, and Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School, Louisiana State University

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
ARKADELPHIA, ARKANSAS
1941

COPYRIGHT, 1941, BY
HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

PRINTED AND BOUND IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE
DEMOCRAT PRINTING AND LITHOGRAPHING COMPANY,
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS.

DEDICATION

MARY SUE MOONEY *epitomizes the tradition of Henderson College. She has for more than three decades shared her life and her scholarship with successive generations of students. Her service has been the pilgrimage of a noble spirit. She has shown many the way to the high adventure of the good life as she quickened their companionship with learning. To her, to her ideals, and to the compelling persuasion of her teaching, this Symposium is respectfully dedicated.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

THE PUBLICATION of this volume has been made possible by the generous financial assistance of President Joseph A. Day. The editor, the contributors, and the alumni of the College are indebted to him for making arrangements for underwriting the cost of this commemorative symposium.

The authors and the editor are grateful to the following publishing houses for permission to make quotations from books published by them:

For the essay "Down in Dixie—But Not Out" by Herbert Drennon acknowledgment is made to:

Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., for quotation from *The Forge* by T. S. Stribling, 1934.

The University of North Carolina Press for quotation from *The Attack on Leviathan* by Donald Davidson, 1938; and for quotation from *The Wasted Land* by Gerald Johnson, 1937.

Mr. Frank Owsley for quotation from "The Pillars of Agrarianism" by Mr. Owsley, published by *The American Review,* March 5, 1935.

G. P. Putnam's Sons for quotation from *Jefferson Davis* by Allen Tate, 1929.

Charles Scribner's Sons for quotation from *The Torches Flare* by Stark Young, 1928; for quotation from *Heaven Trees* by Stark Young, 1927; for quotation from *South Moon Under* by Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, 1933; and for quotation from *The Yearling* by Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, 1938.

Julian Messner, Inc., for quotation from *The Cabin in the Cotton* by Harry Harrison Kroll, 1932.

For the essay "A Quest for Foundations" by Matt Locke Ellis acknowledgment is made to:

G. P. Putnam's Sons for quotation from *The Quest for Certainty* by John Dewey, 1929.

W. W. Norton and Company for quotation from *Experience and Nature* by John Dewey, 1925.

For the essay "Public Education in the South: Status and Needs" by Howard A. Dawson acknowledgment is made to:

Journal of Rural Sociology for quotation from "The Disadvantaged Farm Family in Alabama" by Harold Hoffsommer, December, 1937.

For the essay "The New Persuasian of Democracy" by Charles W. Pipkin acknowledgment is made to:

A. A. Knopf for quotation from *Night Over Europe* by Frederick L. Schuman, 1941.

New York University Press for quotation from *American Neutrality, Trial and Failure* by Charles G. Fenwick, 1940.

University of Chicago Press for quotation from *American and the Strife of Europe* by J. Fred Rippy, 1938.

For the essay "The Chinese—Their Spiritual Earthiness" by George B. Workman acknowledgment is made to Dr. Daniel J. Fleming of the Union Theological Seminary, Mr. J. B. Webster, Dr. Otto Klineberg of Columbia University, Mr. E. M. K. Thomas, Dr. Kenneth S. Latourette of Yale University, Dr. Francis Wei, Dr. Lin Yutang, Mr. S. W. Bushnell, Dr. Frank Millican, Dr. Hu Shih, Mr. Arthur Henderson Smith, Dr. Lucius C. Porter of Yenching and Harvard Universities, and Dr. James Legge; acknowledgment is also made to the John Day Company, publishers of work by Lin Yutang.

The editor wishes to express his appreciation to President Herbert J. Davis for permission to quote from his inaugural address at Smith College, October 17, 1940.

Georgianna Arnett Bonds has given much encouragement and many valuable suggestions in the preparation of this volume. Ethel Stephens Arnett has given valuable aid in mechanical details. The editor is particularly grateful for this service.

The editor desires to express his appreciation for the many courtesies extended by Mr. Hugh Patterson, representative of the Democrat Printing and Lithographing Company. His experience has been invaluable in all matters of design and typography in this volume.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction, by *A. B. Bonds, Jr.* 1

Down In Dixie—But Not Out, by *Herbert Drennon* 13

The South's Human Resources in Total Defense, by *Rupert B. Vance* 41

Industry—A Way of Life, by *John Roy Steelman* 55

A Quest for Foundations, by *Matt L. Ellis* 73

The New Persuasion of Democracy, by *Charles W. Pipkin* 99

The Chinese—Their Spiritual Earthiness, by *George B. Workman* 113

In and Out of Dixie: A Businessman's Viewpoint, by *Hugh D. Hart* 133

Some Biological Factors Involved in Democracy, by *Robert C. Rhodes* 153

Public Education in the South: Status and Needs, by *Howard A. Dawson* 175

Living and Learning in the Secondary School, by *W. T. Rowland* 195

Arkansas Education Looks Ahead, by *Crawford W. Greene* and *Tim Moore Stinnett* 213

Henderson, Today and Yesterday: The Story of the First Fifty Years, by *William Ritchie* 237

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Arkadelphia, Arkansas

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Dear Alumni: May 1, 1941.

This volume is issued in commemoration of the Semi-Centennial of Henderson State Teachers College which occurred during the 1939-40 academic year. It is the work of a few of the outstanding alumni of the College who have achieved positions of importance, but it is representative of the splendid achievements of many more former students in other fields of service.

Through the half-century of its growth the College and its functions have undergone many changes, but its fundamental purpose has remained the same—the all-round development of young men and women to meet the demands of everyday life and to enrich the life of our Nation. We have made no attempt to measure the influence of Henderson, nor can it be measured. The circle has widened until it now reaches into all parts of our Nation and even into the international sphere. Our successful completion of this half-century gives us a greater obligation to the one we now enter.

We express our appreciation to Mr. A. B. Bonds, Jr., for his part in the production of this volume. It was first suggested by him, and through his efforts the materials have been brought together in this valuable contribution to the literature of our day. Mr. Bonds graduated from Henderson in 1935 and is now Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School at Louisiana State University and a Julius Rosenwald Fellow at the University of North Carolina. We are deeply grateful to all who have had a part in giving us this book, and in appreciation we send greetings and best wishes for continued success to all Hendersonians.

For the College,

J. A. DAY, *President.*

INTRODUCTION

In 1939-40 the Henderson State Teachers College celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. During the year a series of appropriate exercises were held commemorating the event. This collection of essays represents the desire of a number of alumni to put in permanent form a tribute to the occasion. It was felt that the publication of a Symposium might be an effective means of representing to friends the spirit and the scholarship of the College. A general theme, The Promise of the South, was selected for the volume, and twelve distinguished alumni were invited to contribute. These men have been chosen for their attainments in their respective fields of endeavor. In the general field of Education, several persons of specialized background were invited to participate. Otherwise, an effort was made to secure a balanced distribution of the points of view by inviting contributions from persons in divergent fields of interest.

Dr. Howard A. Dawson, Director of Rural Service for the National Education Association; Dr. W. T. Rowland, Assistant Superintendent of the Public Schools of Louisville, Kentucky; Mr. Crawford Greene, Director of Research for the Arkansas State Department of Education; and Mr. Tim Moore Stinnett, Assistant Commissioner of Education for the State of Arkansas, were asked to prepare essays relating to their professional activities in the field of Education. Dean Herbert Drennon, of the Mississippi State College Graduate School, was asked to represent the Humanities; Dr. Matt L. Ellis, Director of the Library and Professor of Philosophy at Hendrix College, was chosen as the contributor from the field of Philosophy; Dr. Hugh D. Hart, Vice President and Director of Agencies for the Illinois Bankers Life Assurance Company, was invited to present the business man's viewpoint; Dean Charles W. Pipkin, of the Louisiana State University Graduate School, was selected as the representative of the field of Political Science; Dr. Robert C. Rhodes, Professor and Head of the Department of Biology at Emory University, was requested to present an essay in the field of Natural Science; Dr. John Roy Steelman, Director of the Conciliation Service of the United States Department of Labor, was chosen to present the viewpoint of Labor; Dr. Rupert B. Vance, Research Professor in the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina, was named to represent the field of Sociology; and Dr. George B. Workman, Methodist missionary to China and a Y.M.C.A. official, was asked to contribute an essay on a religious topic. The history of the College was written by Dr. William Ritchie, Head of the Department of History, and Chairman of the Semicentennial Committee.

It is a considerable satisfaction to present the results of their work in this book. Their loyalty and their concern for the welfare of Henderson College cut across pressing obligations and made possible this tribute to the achievements of the College over its first fifty years. In a very fine manner, as the President has indicated in his word of greeting, the honors and the distinctions which these men have won are representative of the attainments of many other alumni. It is particularly true in the academic world that like produces like. The teaching resources of the College have combined to produce a noble heritage of scholarship and citizenship.

May we not with pertinence raise the question of purpose as the College passes into the first year of its second half-century? We live in troubled days, and everywhere about us mankind is making social inventory of the equipment which will be needed to win through to the ancient dream of a quality civilization in a secure world. The quest is by no means universal; for many peoples of the earth today lie crushed and broken, unable to do more than endure their confusion, despair, and surrender. On either side of this unnatural situation are pitched the camps of two great forces. One of these we call totalitarianism; the other we know as democracy. The ghastly drama of world destiny plays itself upon a bloody stage as these ideologies clash in mortal conflict. Unimagined and uncontrolled powers have spawned from this battle. The choices we make in meeting them will affect the national and the international future for years to come. It is of importance that the sharpest inquiry be made of the ingredients of these choices. Herein arises one of the fundamental functions of American education in a crisis age.

This volume makes no pretensions of solving any of the great issues confronting us today. It is far more modest in its plan. Basically, a majority of the essays are devoted to stock-taking and considered thought upon some of the problems confronting the South and the American Nation today. They represent the views of men who have won academic and professional distinction. In this, the larger purpose of the Symposium is found. This volume is published not only to commemorate the semicentennial of an educational institution, but to suggest a revitalization of the educational principle as well. We have advanced in our thinking to a point where we are able to consciously recognize gaps in our knowledge. Granting this, can we not sluff off some of the old inertia and make of education an effective tool for the channelizing of social energies? The idea is not new, but it is doubtful if it ever deserved closer attention than it does today.

The twentieth century has seen the development of a crisis of thought as well as a crisis of economy and politics. This is an era

where every system has been shaken and riven by theory and practice. The continued acquisition of knowledge has not served to alleviate developing social tensions. For, as Henry Adams pointed out, knowledge merely increases the flow of energy upon the earth, and this new energy is both benevolent and malevolent. By implication, our educational endeavor faces an obligation of making a positive contribution in providing criteria of value as each new frontier of knowledge develops. But even then, education does not become the sole or final arbiter. It can supply us with the material for making choices, and by patient research we may piece together a fairly accurate appraisal of the effectiveness of our choices. Yet, once the choice is made, faith is required for our forward move.

The nineteenth century saw a cycle of progressive evolutionism which swept the concept of natural law into attempted measurement of social phenomena. For the socially sapient of the day, this concept of social physics stimulated an industrious application of the statistics of probabilities to a wide range of phenomena. Naturally, the effort encompassed the demonstration of the existence of regularities and sequences in the free will activities of a collectivity of individuals. Man tumbled from his lofty estate to join the forces of natural phenomena, and together with society, his development was charted as a part of cosmic evolution. Presumably, this increasing knowledge of social causation would lead to indefinite improvement in human affairs, because, through his growing knowledge, man could learn the laws controlling his social life and adjust to them with intelligent foresight. There was, of course, the necessity of reconciling this historical determinism with the prevailing theological views of that century. This was ingeniously achieved by the soothing and culturally necessary view that natural law represented the will of a beneficent Providence, or that the universe, being made for man, would in the long run prove friendly to him.

But if one lesson has come to us out of the deterministic period from Comte to Dewey, it is simply this—that neither the achievements of science by themselves, nor the advance of industrial methodology, are immediately identical with the real progress of mankind. There would be few to dispute the fact that man has been materially, emotionally, and intellectually impoverished at critical points since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, in spite of the progress of science and industry. That realization has brought a disquieting thought. We have gradually begun to realize that science and technology are only elements in an existing social totality, and that it is entirely possible in spite of their heralded achievements, that the totality of civilization could be moving backwards. The stunted

moral perceptions of man and the breaking of his nations lend credence to the thought in 1941.

The social thought of the twentieth century stands indicted for its failure to develop concepts of the institutions and behavior patterns of society as a whole. Our natural and physical scientists have been busily engaged in laying the groundwork of an inevitable internationalism based upon technology. The machine knows no boundary lines. But socially, and all too often culturally, we have failed to provide the imagination and the daring needed to constructively guide the great new powers which have been made available for man. We know the ethics of internationalism, but we have been unable to accept the responsibility of implementing them. Mankind stands in the anomalous position of trying to operate an international civilization with national institutions. It cannot be done without such outbreaks and disorders as the world has witnessed in recent years. It is a strange and depressing thought that man has acquired more skill in his control over nature than he has in control of his own economic and governmental institutions. It should be emphasized here that a distinction is made between the control of human institutions by faith and consent, and the other extreme found in totalitarian control which knows only force and chicanery. Our ideal remains a government by consent freely given.

President A. Lawrence Lowell, in his inaugural address at Harvard, in 1909, said that one purpose of a university was "to counteract rather than copy the defects of the civilization of the day." His diagnosis of the academic function is still apropos and still largely unheeded. On every hand we note the lack of success among modern states in achieving the Aristotelian vista of the good life. Man has shown a woeful ineptitude in controlling his dazzling new powers of science. The resulting disruptions have brought him face to face with an unending series of crises. When his political inventiveness finally fails to master the disorder, confusion, and inadequate functioning of his social machinery, the awareness of crisis grows; there is a heightening of tensions, suppressed fears become panic, public morale disintegrates, and the way lies open for the stern absolutism of the dictator. For three hundred years, the Church of England has had in its litany this supplication: "From famine, from battle and murder and from sudden death, from all seditions, privy conspiracy and rebellion, Good Lord deliver us." But neither the English nor their neighbors have seen fit to rely entirely upon providential succor. For when Divine attention chanced to be diverted elsewhere during trying times, nations have not hesitated to invoke immediate and temporal means to obtain deliverance from evil.

INTRODUCTION

Man's continued reliance upon the mechanism of brute force has become a dominant characteristic of the first half of the twentieth cenutry. In this respect, mankind in many of its present social relationships, *has become an anachronism upon the face of the earth.* It was man's failure to control his new economic and technological institutions which led to the outbreak of the World War. It was a similar failure, coupled with the moral bankruptcy of the League of Nations, which led to the renewal of the war in September, 1939. There was a time during the decade of the twenties when firmness and cooperation might have brought order to man's affairs. But fatal indecision and blind irresolution fell before the leviathan of the new technology and an uncontrolled economic system. It was an economic system based upon cant and historical accident, but we have had neither the will nor the humaneness to put it aside. It is no exaggeration to say that there is available today the productive power, the natural and human resources, and the established agencies to feed, clothe, and house the peoples of the earth in a manner at once civilized and adequate. It is equally apparent that there has been neither an equitable nor even a proportional distribution of the world's goods. Baffled by this paradox, people have desperately and willingly accepted the security formula of totalitarianism. But totalitarianism as brought neither peace nor security. When the dictators failed, they led their restless followers into war.

The success or failure of any governmental policy of any kind of government must eventually depend upon the consent of the constituent people. No matter how regimented they may be, unless they are willing to remain so the dictator cannot maintain his grasp upon their destiny. In effect, the state represents the component wills of all its inhabitants. No law nor institution may long endure if it loses the support of this component will.

The common tragedies of recent years have been a great leveling force in knitting men's wills together. But in meeting their mutual problems, the intellectual level has too often been reduced to that of the lowest common denominator. The units of the component will have lacked faith, and when faith is lacking there can be no good will, no fair play, and no justice. If we could win back to the fundamental Christian theses of man's relationship with man; if we could once more make quick and sentient the sympathy and the altruism of the race, we would have taken the longest step toward the re-establishment of equilibrium in human affairs.

There have been occasions in history when the unharnessed energies of the masses have played highly significant roles. The Paris

mob rose in its fury to strike down the injustices perpetuated by royalty. But in the wake of the mob came more injustice. Violence begat violence, and within a few years the people turned to a Corsican corporal for their salvation. The expedient of mere force had not been enough to win for the mob and hold for the people the kind of government they wanted. They had lacked the faith to implement their fundamental desires in social institutions of their own choice. When the momentum of the mob was spent, they slipped back into a new and bloody cycle of violence.

The vast effort of contemporary education in the United States is no less dangerous and unpredictable than the mob unless it is guided and measured by a relentless search for truth. The extension of justice is the responsibility of the social order, but it is the schools who bear the burden of preparing the public mind to accept the institutions for furthering justice. The public has long been conditioned to accept the material contributions of the laboratory, but it has yet to achieve an equal desire for freshness in its social thought. From this reluctance has sprung an indifference which allowed the development of the technological and economic anarchy which plagues the world today. Mankind himself must furnish the inspiration for developing the instruments of social power to control the machine. When enough people see the need and make the need established in the popular mind, then it will be possible for the schools to play their rightful role in extending the sphere of man's living skills. But we must not expect education to legislate or to implement a new way of life. It may be able to aid the process, but certainly it cannot achieve progress unaided. It is of value to regard education as one of the articles of faith by which we may be able to move forward. President Herbert J. Davis, in his inaugural address at Smith College, on October 17, 1940, declared:

"Education of any kind can never be a safe investment; it must always be something of a speculative venture. If it is worth anything at all, it must be a risky business. For by its very nature it must be an experiment in freedom. The life of the spirit must be a life of perfect freedom. If we really believe that the glory of man is in the powers of his mind and spirit, we must provide that freedom in which alone the mind can do its work. It is a farce to talk about the defense of freedom, unless we are ready to accept the fruits of freedom, and, in education, to recognize one chief purpose—to produce free spirits, and to let them work freely."

The desirable course of world progress lies along the lines of increasingly achieving the essential institutions of civilization. The people of the United States subscribe to the belief that this kind of

program may best be found under the aegis of a democracy. Yet we know that democracy has promised much and delivered little. We continue to look to it with faith, for we know that democracy can never be realized unless man remains fixed in his purpose of achieving to the goals it preaches. Its tremendous humane potentialities can never be effected unless its development is guided by a continuing pressure of general intelligence. And this situation requires mutual recognition of the part which wide social resolution may play in creating the conditions of a quality existence. The long goal must be created and preserved by intelligent men.

The democratic faith has from the beginning been a cluster of ideals which would serve as standards with which to measure conduct. Fundamental in our thought in the past has been the ideal that it is possible for men to govern their lives by stable ethical principles. It is the opposite of an ethic of expediency or of force. The persistence of the democratic faith in an age of science is a phenomenon of much significance. The essence of the formula is faith. Not one of its doctrines can be proved in any scientific sense.

At bottom, all social philosophies rest upon conceptions of values. From time to time as events develop, it may become necessary to restate these values in terms of their functional relationship to the changed conditions of our age. Herein lies the supreme test for us as we come to the time of restatement of the democratic values in an unfriendly world.

The fundamental thing for America to remember is an event which happened three thousand years ago. It was the indictment count in the trial of Socrates. It is a warning that we must not lose ourselves in those ideas and activities which the existing organization of society has instilled into us. When we lose the ability to rise above our isolated ideas and concepts of everyday life, we have lost the ability of objective self-appraisal. And self-admitted truth is no basis for social action. It is, however, a vital ingredient in the totalitarian formula. Plato's demand that the state should be ruled by philosophers was no idle vagary. It meant that the rulers should have the wit and courage to apply the various energies and branches of knowledge in a unity which would lift otherwise destructive elements into productive ones in the fullest sense. Reason may never lose itself in a single thought. Rather, it exists in the whole system of ideas, so that every idea is understood and applied its true meaning.

Socrates was an individualist. Thirty centuries pay him homage for insisting that the actions and aims of man must not be the product of blind necessity. He set himself against mere tradition and resigna-

tion in the decisive problems of existence, and undertook the self-appointed and unpleasant task of "social gadfly" to the populace of Athens. It was his thesis that there need not be an end to thought, even in regard to matters which had long known comfortable acceptance. The attitude was not well-received in some quarters, and there arose a demand for his conformity to customs protected by the gods, and an unquestioning adaptation to the traditional forms of life. But the Greek philosopher asserted the principle that man should know what he does, and shape his own destiny. His god dwells within him—in his own reason and will. Community reaction to this doctrine is too well known for repetition here, but it is of interest that the principle for which he died has come down to us unchanged except for setting in time and place. The tragic dialectic still governs the political process, and haunts mankind's brave effort to build for himself an associative existence with balance nurture for soul and body.

We are creatures of our environment; political, natural, and otherwise. The manifold and complex influences of life about us shape our destinies, but we cannot forget that the distinguishing mark of man is his will that life shall be made good. He is ever the anxious architect of the society in which he is to live. If he should find that existing forms are inadequate to meet his fundamental aspirations as a social being, then they should be adapted to his needs or discarded in favor of others. Only when the free criticism of the Socratic spirit exists may such examination take place. That speculation finds its freest home in the pursuit of liberty and in the free association of men for their political and spiritual development.

The realism needed in American and Southern social thought should be quickly grasped. The economic tensions arising from inequalities of opportunity foment a madness as demoralizing as war itself in its economic, political, and social effects. In this country we entertain a great many conflicting opinions on the political and economic policies of modern government. This is healthy when conflict of opinion defines issues and leads to action. But is socially destructive when these opinions cancel themselves out in fruitless forensics. Education in democracy has an opportunity to illuminate for the many the philosophy of government and law which adjusts in human terms the economic and social problem of an unbridled technological system. The abolition of poverty, the improvement of the working conditions of labor, and the promotion of health of all the people are among the fundamental considerations of essential democracy. The educational system and the governmental system need not operate in a vacuum.

The significant objective ahead is to continue to make ourselves aware of the changes which must come if democracy is to endure. It is of tremendous importance that there be no lessening of the effort to raise the level of public opinion on the value and the purposes of our democratic efforts. There is no strategy which can equal an intelligent understanding of the objectives in mind.

The ideals of justice which should undergird our thoughts of social progress today are not mere temporary expedients for an emergency period. They are the long verities, and in them lies the plan of a saner and more just economic system. But we live in an era of "blood, toil, tears, and sweat," and there is little likelihood that we shall achieve the progress of morality by awaiting the unaided triumph of the idea. The policies of negativism and drift have brought us to our present crisit. They are capable of leading us to complete destruction. Manifestly, the situation we face is one which calls for a renewal of the democratic faith. But what part of it? Certainly 1941 is not 1776; nor yet is it 1929. We must arouse ourselves to the fact that the old forms have not yet solved our problems, and that there is little hope of their resurgence at this late date. America is confronted with the necessity of creating something new in the way of representative governments. And in meeting that necessity it will become a duty to abandon our long-held disposition to regard unpleasant truths as heresies.

More than one hundred years ago, Horace Mann warned the American people that "If we maintain institutions which bring us within the action of new and unheard of powers, without taking any corresponding measures for the government of those powers, we shall perish by the very instruments prepared for our happiness."

The prophetic utterance of the great educator finds its fulfillment in the life of the twentieth century. All about us are the evidences of our failure to control the new powers of the machine, and we are paying a toll of immeasurable social degredation for our lethargy. Fortunately, there are many American educators who are today in full awareness of the crisis the Nation is facing. It is their opportunity to recast the direction of educational effort in terms of its greatest functional utility as an instrument of moral social progress. The post-war world will either be a more sane and a more secure and more happy world, or it will relapse into the old barbarism of economic and cultural conflict. It is not pertinent then to ask whether we want a new social order. It is rather our task to decide what shall be done with the one unfolding before us.

If there is a way to more just social order, it will include a new and close alliance between economic practice and social morality. The present economic system has proved its lack of motive power in the achievement of a democratic society. It has also proved a failure in its futile effort to direct the growth of a modern industrial civilization. The great challenge to the American Nation and to the South is to plan the future with a vision of what a democratic nation can do with its natural and human resources when they are all used to promote the aims of good living and to advance good will and justice among all men.

A. B. BONDS, JR.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

March 28, 1941

THE ESSAY BY HERBERT DRENNON is a contribution by a student of English and American Literature. Dr. Drennon was graduated from Henderson-Brown in 1917. He spent the following two years in study at Vanderbilt University, and in 1919 he received the M.A. degree from that university. For six years thereafter he taught at a college in Mississippi. Then in 1925 he began his work for the doctorate at Vanderbilt. For two years he attended the regular sessions at Vanderbilt and the summer sessions at the University of Chicago. In 1927 he was awarded a fellowship in the English Department at the University of Chicago. During that academic year he was able to complete the requirements for the doctorate. He was graduated with the Ph.D. degree from the University of Chicago in 1928.

Upon receiving the doctor's degree, he was elected head of the English Department at a college in Kentucky. He held that position for ten years before returning to Mississippi to become Dean of the Graduate School at Mississippi State College.

Dr. Drennon has written articles for learned journals and philological quarterlies, including the *Englische Studien* published in Leipzig, Germany. The article printed here presents his opinions, critical and otherwise, concerning literature of and about the South.

DOWN IN DIXIE
(But Not Out)

HERBERT DRENNON
Dean of the Graduate School, Mississippi State College

WISE PEOPLE today should avoid dogmatic statements about Dixie. One is driven to such a conclusion who reads some of the studies and interpretations to which the Southern scene is constantly being subjected. And one is also obliged to ponder these interpretations at great length indeed before he begins to perceive some kind of order taking shape in chaos, for divergences of opinion and dissimilar conclusions drawn from supposedly incontrovertible facts are likely to be overwhelming for one undertaking a study of this our Southland. To add to the confusion, the vehemence of controversy has frequently bred bad manners in the realm of literary and social criticism, and one sometimes saddens at the sight of Southern gentility gone sour among students of the Southern scene. Certainly, concerning a subject where the opinions of sincere scholars clash so violently, one should be quite modest in his generalizations on the South.

This essay, let it be said at once, *discovers* no heretofore unknown South; unearths no profound new problems, presents no guaranteed panaceas for Southern ills; takes no last-ditch stand for dogmas, native or alien. If some insist that Dixie is both down and out, I have no blood quarrel with them. Dixie is a potent area for engendering opinions, intelligent or otherwise, and herein are presented a few of mine born of no hope that they will ever change others.

Seemingly, there are at least two ways to take a stand in Dixie these days. One can take a stand with a back-

ward glance to the Old South, which is geography that somehow got entangled, suffused, once upon a time with human emotions and experiences to develop a lingering tradition. One can take a stand with a glance at the New South, and the silent speech of men dead becomes reverberant again, and ghostly voices of an agrarian order, passing, gone, commingle cacophonously with voices in a living world where old meanings fade, and strange tongues, with pentecostal emphasis and insistence, speak of a South that must become more highly industrialized. And above the furious babel are voices reiterative to the effect that the Old South was a myth, and that the New South is meaningless, non-existent, in the sense that it is a definite cultural entity. The only definite coalescent factor in our culture is politics ("Solid South"), which stems from an old and lingering grievance and constitutes the only unity that this entity called "The South" possesses. Some have felt that that bond should likewise be broken.

To be wise today one speaks of regions—Southeast or Southwest, sometimes, too, Midsouth and Deep South—with proper regard only for the unity which is derived from contiguous spaces, spaces, however, differentiated by sundry physical contours that nature made and man must accept. Of course, some—S. J. Cash in *The Mind of the South,* for example—believe that the traditional soul of the South lives on, pervading these contiguous regions, though shorn a bit of certain qualities found in the original pattern; but most of us, now that we have learned the sociological lore, speak of Southern regions and human geographies. A few, however, find it slightly difficult to speak with soul-stirring sense of the Old Region or the New. Such terms, too, play havoc with one's connotative vocabulary. Region somehow lacks the symbolic quality and rich connotation of words like the South or Dixie.

Region, however, is a convenient term for human geographers who perforce must deal with the bi-facts of our southern area, pointing out the bi-racial, bi-cultural, bi-economic, and bi-social characteristics of the land wherein we live. In time the word region may come to have the symbolic meaning that Dixie now possesses. One can take a stand for living symbols; one usually does. Dixie is still a symbol with rich meaning to many, and that is the Dixie that may be down but not out—at least not quite out, let us hope.

They keep telling us what is wrong down in Dixie. Poets, propagandists, industrialists, agrarians, geographers, scientists, statisticians, historians, novelists, nomadic journalists, Northerners, Southerners, all of them, write poems, draw graphs, paint pictures, take photographs, pen novels, make surveys, with one end in view—to expose the ills of Dixie and diagnose the disease of which, some say, we are slowly dying. Though similar symptoms are discovered, unfortunately the diagnoses do not agree nor is prognostic unanimity achieved. The diagnosticians at work in and *on* Dixie have followed divergent lines of investigation, or no lines at all, in the latter instance ending up in quackery, however well-meaning it may be. That is to say: some have studied the case history of the South; some have studied present symptoms only. Both have vigorously prescribed, but the medicine men have not agreed for the simple reason that their clinical techniques have differed so widely.

It is easy to prove a thesis when one does not have to document his evidence. That is to say that in writing designed to explain, for example, the nexus of cause and effect in history, one can arrive at predetermined goals leisurely and surely provided he does not have to document the route he travels. This fact becomes evident when

we look at some of the generalizations that have been made concerning the history of the South and its bearing upon our present predicament. Take this passage from Allen Tate's *Jefferson Davis:*

> The South was the last stronghold of European civilization in the western hemisphere, a conservative check upon the restless expansiveness of the industrial North, and the South had to go. The South was permanently old-fashioned, backward-looking, slow, contented to live upon a modest conquest of nature, unwilling to conquer the earth's resources for the fun of the conquest; contented, in short, to take only what man needs; unwilling to juggle the needs of man in the illusory pursuit of abstract wealth. . . . The War between the States was the second and decisive struggle of the Western spirit against a stable spirit of ordered economy—and the Western won.

That is a brilliant summation of a thesis, and it may be true, but one could hardly be expected to repeat it as truth until he had found out more about the *evidence* which presumably Mr. Tate had in mind as he wrote. Maybe he had in mind a particular kind of South—not a lumpish geographical area inhabited by different types of people. At just what time was "the South" all that Mr. Tate says about it in sentence two of the statement—1800? 1820? 1840? Some say (Herbert Agar, *Pursuit of Happiness,* for example, following Professor Dodd the historian) that "what the outside world regards as the 'Old South'—the life, the philosophy, the prejudices, the mannerisms—was dominant only for twenty years before the Civil War." Also what South was it that was contented "to live upon a modest conquest of nature?" Was it the South of the old aristocratic Tidewater families of Virginia? Was it the South of the hunter-fisher-farmer type of the piney woods? Was it the South of the thrifty yeomenry? Were the historians wrong, too, who wrote about the trek of immigrants

west, exploiting nature (the land), exhausting it as frontier surrendered to frontier? Does Mr. Tate mean by "abstract wealth" cash, stocks, and bonds? The slaves of the plantation owners, in a sense, represented "abstract wealth." If the planters (and I am assuming here that Mr. Tate's "the South" means the old, conventional, aristocratic South traditionally written about) were not seekers for "abstract wealth," then it is hard to explain why the Natchez nabobs in Mississippi, for example, strove so vigorously to control the State's banking interests and squandered funds in reckless speculation twenty-five or thirty years before the Civil War. Finally, the whole sweeping generalization about the struggle between the European spirit and the Western spirit may be absolutely true. All that we should need to test its truthfulness would be to find out how much of Europe Mr. Tate had in mind, and what particular meaning he had assigned to the phrase "European spirit," and what definite facts furnished grounds for his conceptualization.

Take another example from Professor Owsley's "The Pillars of Agrarianism":

> Once this foundation is securely built, the agrarian society will grow upon it spontaneously and with no further state intervention beyond that to which an agricultural population is accustomed. The old communities, the old churches, the old songs would arise from their moribund slumbers. Art, music, and literature could emerge into the sunlight from the dark cramped holes where industrial insecurity and industrial insensitiveness have often driven them. There would be a sound basis for statesmanship to take the place of demagoguery and corrupt politics. Leisure, good manners, and the good way of life might again be ours.

Presumably, Professor Owsley means that "the good way of life" existed before the Civil War. If so, its bless-

ings, some state, were not so generously scattered among the dwellers in the land. And, in spite of the fact that subsistence farming was never more dominant in America than it was in the South before the Civil War, very little art, music, and literature emerged "into the sunlight," though industrialism, with its "dark cramped holes," "insecurity," and "insensitiveness" had sought but little if any sanctuary in the Southland. Writing about the literary aspect of the matter, Tate, in his "The Profession of Letters in the South," explains that the antebellum South was poor in literature because of "a grave fault in the intellectual life. It was hagridden with politics." And then there was the Negro—again! Great cultures, says he, are "rooted in peasantries—in free peasantries. . . . the peasant is the soil. The Negro slave was a barrier between the ruling class and the soil." Perhaps it would take more than Professor Owsley's agrarian "pillars" to arouse us out of our "moribund slumbers," if we are in this somnolent state, for we would still have politics and the Negro in our midst.

Maybe such statements as those above represent the workings of the poetic imagination. A fact or two may well serve as the occasion or point of departure for the functioning of poetic imagination as when a Shelley sees autumn leaves, a Keats hears a nightingale, and a Wordsworth surprises daffodils dancing in the breeze. Mr. John Crowe Ransom, no mean poet as poets go these days, once wrote a very interesting essay on "The Esthetic of Regionalism" as the result of a few chance scenes he glimpsed through the window of an eastbound train down in New Mexico. It was some Indians "beautifully arrayed," threshing grain, laughing and singing, in the outskirts of the towns through which he passed.

The illustrations above are not intended to be critical of the agrarian point of view. They are simply given as examples to show how one's generalizing imagination may work when one is not constrained to document one's thesis.

The Agrarians, as everybody knows, have done much to stimulate contemporary thinking concerning what Josiah Royce wrote about thirty years ago in an essay on "Provincialism." "By provincialism," he said, "I mean, in general, the devotion of each community to the cherishing of its own peculiar social life, and of its own unique ideals." Substitute agrarianism for provincialism and one has in Royce's statement the point of view cultivated so brilliantly and vigorously by the essayists who contributed to *I'll Take My Stand* and *Who Owns America.* Nevertheless, the Agrarians have sometimes been compared to Don Quixote "charging the windmills"; others have intimated that they have been obsessed with the "magnolia metaphysics" of a golden age the like of which was never found on land or sea. It is easy to understand the inspiration of such antagonistic criticism. Most of it resulted from the fact that the critics believed that the Agrarians, in their earlier, enthusiastic pronouncements, had let their creative imagination bear the burden of proof for the thesis projected, had oversimplified historical explanation, had been indifferent to contemporary studies in economics and sociology, and had neglected to document their evidence. In brief, they had spoken too pontifically without proper regard for the fact that they needed to offer more than their word of honor as Southern gentlemen to sustain the generalizations which they promiscuously made.

The Agrarians have done commendable service in focusing attention upon the need of the South to preserve its own cultural identity. Their critics have likewise done a good job in that they have forced the Agrarians to study

the prosaic factual data uncovered by scholarly research in the fields of history, economics, and sociology for the purpose of adding weight to the thesis they championed. The result is that most of the Agrarians today are far more learned than they were a decade ago, and therefore more modest in their contentions. But they still take their stand in Dixie, at least spiritually, a fact for which the contemporary South should be deeply grateful.

The last decade has seen many evidences that Dixie is still a going concern. Much digging has been done by the scholars of Chapel Hill to furnish factual material to serve as a basis for formulating plans to improve Southern conditions. The investigators, however, have been more successful in gathering data and in describing problems than they have been in reaching an agreement concerning the solutions of problems. Nevertheless, Vance's *Human Geography,* Odum's *Southern Regions,* Webb's *Divided We Stand* (not Chapel Hill, however), and various factual studies of population trends, peasantry, soil erosion, labor conditions in the mill and on the farms, and matters of that kind have served to make men of letters sociologists, economists, and historians almost overnight. The substitution of an intellectual for an emotional interest in Southern problems is a good sign that the seeds of promise in Dixie are not dead.

Since the publication of *I'll Take My Stand* (1930), many books and articles of varying significance and interest, dealing in whole or in part with the South, have appeared. Professors Vance's and Odum's works, referred to above, represent the highwater mark of the results of the scientific method of scholarly research applied to the field of social sciences. *Culture in the South,* edited by W. T. Couch in 1934, was, at that time, the most comprehensive and authoritative treatment of the Southern scene

to be found, and it still remains the most comprehensive one-volume treatment. Such books have furnished some of the grist, and, in a few cases, nearly all of it, for works like Johnson's *The Wasted Land,* Raper's *Preface to Peasantry,* a few chapters in Davidson's *The Attack on Leviathan,* Johnson, Embree, and Alexander's *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy,* Nixon's *Forty Acres and Steel Mules,* and Caldwell and Bourke-White's *You Have Seen Their Faces.* At least three journalists have written books of a discovering and interpretative nature within the last three years, dealing wholly with the South except in one instance: Daniels' *A Southerner Discovers the South* (1938), Stokes' *Chip Off My Shoulder* (1940) and Cash's *The Mind of the South* (1941). Cash's book, a highly civilized treatment of a difficult subject, is a good example of the fact that since the publication of *I'll Take My Stand* in 1930 the desire of Southerners to interpret the Southern way of life in Dixie has shown no sign of abatement.

In spite of divergences of opinion and much acrimonious bickering manifested, some definite achievements have resulted from these investigations. We know today a good bit more about the people of the South, their history and contemporary problems, than we did a decade ago. We understand the myth of the Old South better than we used to. We know more about the real aristocrats of the Old South, their number, manners, and customs, and the part they played in shaping some of our traditions. We know that many "aristocrats," those who came to be such, stemmed from an humble and common background. We know more about the yeomanry and the so-called poor whites. We know more about the meaning of the forces that culminated in the Civil War, and how the dogma of white supremacy became vitally important in an era of Reconstruction when the South found itself

forced to use foul means or fair in order to preserve a semblance of its cultural heritage. We know more about the part the Negro has played as scapegoat and alibi to explain our cultural lag. We are more familiar with all phases of soil and human erosion in the South. We know a bit more about the effect the money economy of the North and East, with its high degree of industrialization, has produced in making the South the economic problem number one of the Nation. Gradully, we are getting to be an informed people, concerning our place in the scheme of things, thanks to the books and articles that have been written about us.

What are some of the diseases which the diagnosticians have pointed out and what are some of the cures? According to Gerald W. Johnson, "Waste is the enemy. Waste of land, waste of people, waste of time, waste of energy—these, and no outside foe, are throttling her." For a cure? If the South cannot overcome its "interstate," "institutional," and "sectarian" jealousies, "then its goose is cooked." We must industrialize more, but not on a highly concentrated scale; otherwise nothing awaits us but "the horror portrayed in *Tobacco Road.*"

In most of Professor Donald Davidson's writings dealing with Southern problems, he emphasizes that the exploitation of the South by the industrial East is our unique disease. The South is exploited by an industrial imperialism whose headquarters are in the East. We are exploited economically, politically, and culturally. Webb's *Divided We Stand* furnishes plenty of factual data that substantiate the thesis of economic exploitation. But what of the cure? Our leaders must have the wit and the wisdom to deal with regions as definite cultural entities. "The industrial regime can be limited and curtailed and finally transformed; negatively, by withdrawing the subsidies and pro-

tections legally extended to monopolistic industry and continued even under the New Deal; affirmatively, by fostering farm ownership, 'production for use' at home, and like measures that diminish the hold of the money economy." Parts of this cure are suggested by various writers: Ransom in "Happy Farmers," Owsley in "The Pillars of Agrarianism," Embree, Johnson, and Alexander in *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy,* O'Donnell in "Looking Down the Cotton Row," Johnson in *The Wasted Land,* and Daniels in *A Southerner Discovers the South.*

In *Forty Acres and Steel Mules,* Professor Nixon finds the disease to be the "American system." High tariff and freight-rate discrimination have worked to our disadvantage, and the Southern tenant-landlord situation, with its attendant evils, is due neither to the shiftlessness and biological inferiority of the tenant nor to the brutal exploitative nature of the landlord. For a cure? A more humanized and publicized technical knowledge made available to the masses is needed. Furthermore, the economic security and the social interests of Southern farmers, laborers, and Negroes must be improved by a regional planning that is "limited and guided by national policy."

The diseases mentioned above and the cures therefor are typical in no end of books and articles written on the South. One of the problems that all the regional planners face as they contemplate improvement of the South is that presented by the Negro. Mr. Davidson believes that we should follow "the traditional Southern insistence that the Negro be put in a separate category and that his problem be treated separately." On the other hand, Professor Nixon feels that "the Negro problem, in its economic aspects and otherwise, is becoming comparatively less Southern and more national." Some feel that the Negro, because of the factors of time and place and long historical association

with Southern whites, has become an organic part of the *mores* of our culture. He cannot be shunted aside or put into a separate category so far as his rights to social justice are concerned. More and more Southerners like Dr. W. W. Alexander and Dr. W. A. Weatherford are becoming interested in bringing about a better inter-racial understanding between the two races, for it seems that destiny has decreed that both of them must live together. More and more, too, Southern novelists are portraying Negro characters in their books with a proper regard for them and their problems as human beings. By overt statement or indirect implication, they are saying that Negroes have rights that should be respected. I am not thinking here of the type of novels written by men like Stribling but of such books as Hubert Anthony Shands' *White and Black* (1922), William March's *Come In At The Door* (1934), Francois de la Roche's *Mississippi Mood* (1937), James Robert Peery's *Stark Summer* (1939), and Carson McCullers' *The Heart Is a Lonely Hunter* (1940). I do not mean that these novels are all mainly concerned with Negroes but that where Negroes do figure in the narrative they are presented as human beings and not as menials, villains, or the simple folklore children of tradition. Their virtues and their weaknesses are those to be expected of the children of men.

And speaking of the novelists, in what way have they been portraying the Southern scene? No one has been at more pains than certain Southern novelists to spin a yarn the warp and woof of which reveals the familiar texture of strands long drawn out by the social historians of the regional areas. Sometimes the novelists have done first-class jobs in handling their material by not losing themselves in the reiteration of conventionally known symptoms or in the abstraction of socio-economic concepts. The char-

acters involved have emerged above the problems. Sometimes, however, the novelists have stressed the abnormal in their treatment of character to the point of what, paradoxically, may be called romantic naturalism. Some have fused their material with a meaning that could only have point in "a closed garden" where acts and deeds follow axioms set up with mathematical precision. Some have sought escape in another kind of closed garden, a world modelled along lines of an accepted kind of tradition. Some, using similar materials, have posed no problems except the eternal one of presenting characters at odds with circumstances that somehow win our interest because in them we see our complex brothers dallying superbly or ignominiously with destiny.

There is an interesting passage in Stark Young's *The Torches Flare* (1928) that illustrates two of the ways that Southern novelists have treated their materials. The speakers are in the library of Clearwater University:

> "This stuff," he said. "Do you mean to tell me they feed students on this?"
>
> "What is it?" I said. "Feeding is a strong word."
>
> He showed me the title, *Stories of the South.*
>
> "Well, what's the matter with that?" I said.
>
> "Sentimental rot! Lies! Still talking about the old days and their romance, and Southern ladies and chivalry and serenades! And what astonishes me is that some of these fellows I see in this lot have been associated with liberalism always. There's John Sterne, well, I'd say for him to be keeping up this old gag is simply astounding."
>
> Maclean . . . saw himself as a Southern radical. If that poor John Sterne's stories had proved that all the old-time romance was lies, the gentlemen all blackguards, and the ladies haggard women who were worked to death, or silly uneducated belles, he would

have been a liberal. This would have been truth and he its prophet.

[Hal, the character to whom Maclean was speaking, answers him:]

"I dare say there's a lot in what you say . . . but it's only natural, of course, that a people who had lost their cause and had a hard time afterward and were so poor and had their pride hurt so, and saw a thing they had been born to dying away from them in a new age, should have created a defense in some sort of a beautiful tradition."

[Maclean replied:]

"If science can look every passing fact in the face, why can't literature?"

This passage focuses attention upon two types of Southern fiction: the romantic and the realistic. A little later Stark Young reveals an awareness of the trend which Southern realism would take once the writers began to see life as science sees it.

Arthur, speaking to Hal, says:

"Take these ducks . . . how they put it over with the great public. How they vulgarize or force and overstate or fake."

Stark Young himself has been the Southern writer noted for creating "a defense in some sort of a beautiful tradition." In a passage in *Heaven Trees,* a speaker utters these words: "It all seems romance now to me so far back in the fifties, like a gentle elegy of remembered things, never quite real almost, unless it be as music and light are real." Young has glorified the good way of life that tradition has associated with the aristocratic South. *Heaven Trees* presents a strange though unforgotten romantic world that a reminiscent pen sketches with that gentle love and kindness which the heart bestows upon old and

splendid things. In *The Torches Flare, River House* and *So Red the Rose,* the world of "taste in manners, decorum and conduct" lives again, but somehow it seems unreal, a shadowy world of receding elegance and splendor.

What kind of world have the Southern writers given us when they have looked with the eye of science at the facts of life? What have our realists done? They have had a first way, a second way, and a third. And the last has done passing well.

There is the realist who has followed the social historian in the treatment of problems. On a small scale, we have a novel such as Harry Harrison Kroll's *The Cabin in the Cotton.* On a large scale, there is the work of T. S. Stribling.

As an extreme example of a Southern novel, dealing with Southern situations and inspired by propagandistic motives, there is Kroll's *The Cabin in the Cotton* (1932). It concerns a boy, Dan Morgan, son of a tenant, who aspires to free himself from his "raisin' " and become somebody. He works as bookkeeper for Wilson Lord in the Mississippi Delta. Lord's plantation practices follow the traditional pattern. He fleeces the Negroes and poor whites out of what they make, forcing some to become cotton-stealers and incendiarists. One night Dan spies on some white tenants who are burning Lord's gin, and he tells Lord, who has them arrested. Dan is to be chief witness against his kind, but suffers a change of heart when he learns from Luke Culbertson, father of the gin-burners, that Lord had robbed Tom Morgan, Dan's father, for twenty years.

> "Yur iddication," said Luke, "been paid for, Danny. Yur paw paid fur ye. Paid in advance—started to paying a long time before you war born, and paid a turrible price."

Suddenly Dan realizes that he must tell the truth about Lord which his bookkeeping experience has taught him. It was while he was on his way to the preliminary trial that Dan saw a scene which Kroll describes as follows:

> In one place they overtook a negro carrying a sack over his shoulder, and looking hopefully backward for a possible lift; a white trash family just ahead, taking the next week's rations home; and a big car stopped at the roadside, the negro driver changing a punctured tyre for the spare, while the portly man, obviously a planter of substance, stood looking on with a cigar elevated in his teeth to keep the curl of smoke out of his eyes. There they were, thought Dan—the three biological groups: nigger, poor white, and planter. Dan did not have much abstract sense, but his study of biology and social science in high school—studies in which he took an intense interest—gave him to know that here was a situation so complex as to defy analysis: the aristocrat looking upon the black man with a mixture of racial antipathy, and in proportion to the black's docility, a gentle, wise paternalism; the aristocrat looking at the poor white with mixed intolerance and disgust, mostly disgust; the nigger looking up at the grand aristocrat but down upon the poor white; and all of them driving mules to skin the land of cotton, more cotton, and still more cotton. It was a chase in mad circles, with cotton the centre. The nigger, the poor white, the planter. A vast business with no method or sense of business. The system—that was it. . . . It was plain as the nose on your face; but again, like your nose it was so close you could not see it. The planting system was the nose on the face of the South, and it had got to running from a chronic inner disease that no one had a cure for.

The kind of realism indicated above sounds like a page out of Raper's *Preface to Peasantry* or Caldwell's running comments in *You Have Seen Their Faces.* Just as

Stribling contrasts Cady, a shiftless, mean, poor white, with Toussaint, a mulatto, having many noble qualities, and does it for more than fictional purposes, so does Kroll contrast Nordie Lord, the planter's voluptuous daughter, with Juny Stovall, daughter of a poor white tenant. Take this scene between Dan and Nordie at the time when he was infatuated with her:

> He kissed her fiercely. "You've got to marry me—"
>
> She laughed that laugh again.
>
> "Oh, baby, if you start anything like that, I'll kick up from here and leave you cold!"

Compare that with Kroll's description of Dan's feelings toward Juny after his change of heart had taken place and he had gone back to his kind:

> Juny was fair, with nordic purity [not *Nordie's* kind though!] of colouring in eye and skin and hair. . . . He remembered out of his reading that the poor whites of the deep South, and mountaineers of the highland South, possessed the greatest native purity of any people in the northern continent. That fact seemed to take on meaning as he looked at Juny.

That is the kind of realism we get when the picture is painted "As Truth will paint it, and as Bards will not." I hope I have not stressed it unduly.

T. S. Stribling has been dutifully damned in manifold ways by Southern critics; for example, Robert Penn Warren's "T. S. Stribling: A Paragraph in the History of Critical Realism." Some have accused him of writing for the lust of profit; some have blamed him for his unconscionable propensity to portray Southern ways in a manner in keeping with Yankee predilections; some have accused him of being wholly ignorant of Southern folkways and traditions, and especially ignorant of the historical background and circumstances out of which the Vaiden trilogy stemmed.

And doubtless he has deserves to be anathematized by all true worshippers of the Southern way of life. So I have felt after reading a book like *Birthright* or *Teeftallow*. But Stribling has considerable narrative merit, and he has made good use of all the historical material necessary for background in depicting the rise and fall of Colonel Miltiades Vaiden. His realism, however, suffers from his habit of always introducing his pet observations on Southern beliefs and customs into his narrative, thus disrupting its continuity to the displeasure of his readers. He is like a villian in an old-time melodrama who destroys dramatic illusion by his numerous "asides." For examples:

> Mr. Lacefield stood up and proposed a toast to the Confederacy. Marcia did not drink her small glassful. She had the hillman's social intractability of drinking too much or none.
>
> White educated Southerners are completely cut off from black educated Southerners by the inherited attitudes of master and slave, and the one really does not know that the other exists.
>
> Waterloo was undergoing one of those characteristic religious orgies of the South.

And so on. Stribling knows a good many things about Southern ways, but his realism suffers because Stribling the propagandist oftentimes overshadows Stribling the literary artist. As Warren so well shows, Stribling is always making a "case" for the character in whose cause he is interested, Peter Siner, for example, or Toussaint Vaiden.

Another type of Southern realist, writing about "the facts of life" with *infinite tenderness,* as one critic puts it in his comment on *Journeyman,* is Erskine Caldwell. One character, speaking of Semon Dye in this book, says there never was a preacher like him—and he perhaps was right! Nor is the story of the Jeeter Lester family realis-

tically true to the facts of life even though "the facts of life" suffer quite an unveiling in *Tobacco Road.* Though I never saw the play *Tobacco Road* performed, I did see what purported to be a burlesque presentation. The burlesque was a failure because one can hardly burlesque that which is a burlesque to begin with. There are Lesters in the South, everybody knows, and there are harelipped girls like Ellie May. But my observation has been that even people like the Lester family are seldom indifferent to the conduct of their womenfolk or neglectful of their dead. That this is *romantic naturalism* in the sense that it represents an exaggerated departure from the normal, needs no special emphasis. The whole tone and manner of the book belies the facts of life. It is as unlikely as is the description of Jeeter's squeezing Lov's sack of turnips until the juice squirted through the sack into Jeeter's eyes and dripped from his whiskers. That's too much juice for a turnip!

In spite of the implication of the magistrate's decision that Caldwell's *God's Little Acre* represented a truthful treatment of decaying and impoverished families, "illiterate," brought to this *impasse* by virtue of the conditions that existed on the farm and in the mill in a certain region in the South, I am forced to take other views of the matter. It is not primarily concerned with a realistic treatment of Southern conditions at all. The book reminds me very much of the theme presented—not the story—in D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover.* The philosopher of *God's Little Acre* is Ty Ty, and his views reveal a Freudian sophistication far removed from the world of the conventional illiterate "poor white." The priapic embodiment of Ty Ty's philosophy is Will Thomson, the man who "turns the power on." As phallic hero, he is the primitive engendering power of nature—a creative force

that works brutally if necessary to fulfill its purposes without regard to man's conventions and moral laws. As hero of the mill workers, he is the agent that turns on the power, making the machinery operate that engendered life may live. No, *God's Little Acre* is not particularly concerned with socio-economic problems in the South. Some of its characters have been to school to Kraft-Ebing and Sigmund Freud.

William Faulkner, another Southern "realist," deals with subject-matter of the closed garden type, not in the sense, however, that roses and honey-suckle grow there. It is a closed garden in the sense that the world he presents is one in which, for the most part, only abnormal people move and have their being midst strange and horrible complications. They are simple souls, living in a restricted sphere and manifesting for the most part only the brutal and primitive traits of mankind. They live in a world shorn of all elegance, sentiment, or nobility—a world where no kindness is or heartfelt splendor. Surely, such novels as *Sanctuary, The Sound and Fury, As I Lay Dying,* and *The Wild Palms* are as unrealistic, so far as an honest portrayal of the Southern scene, its people and manners, is concerned as are the most romantic novels that the South has produced. A genius, I suppose, can write literature about a putrescent rat in a garbage can in a back alley whereas a literary hack would fail though he had lilies and love for his theme. And, Mr. Faulkner, in spite of his concern with horrible subject-matter, has written powerfully and well in several of his works, though they are works mostly confined to a closed garden where both heroic and common humanity are seemingly taboo. This is certainly true for the general pattern of Faulkner's work though in a book like *The Unvanquished,* for example,

there will be found, here and there, some exceptions—but they are exceptions.

Writing in *The Oxford Magazine,* at Oxford, Mississippi, in 1934, Phil Stone, a lifelong friend of William Faulkner's, pointed out that the author liked the companionship of "unliterary people" especially. Tracing the cultural background of Faulkner, Mr. Stone wrote about two upheavals which created the social order that has furnished materials for most of the saga of the creator of the Snopes family. One was the abolition of slavery which made "the old manorial plantation living . . . a thing of the past." The other was the change of election methods in Mississippi, the system of primary election taking the place of the convention method which the old aristocrats had exploited to their political advantage. This change gave rise to the demagogue, who, catering to those whom "old ante-bellum ladies . . . with calm and cultured scorn" called the rednecks, supplanted these new leaders. "It is this social and political upheaval," says Mr. Stone, "that is the dominant theme of Faulkner's saga of the Snopes family. . . ." Presumably, Mr. Stone could have also said that Faulkner, in most of his work, has been trying to give a realistic picture of the people belonging to the area whom this social upheaval affected. If his works are truly fictional studies of an era of social and cultural upheaval in this part of the South, it is passing strange that his realistic handling of theme and character, the kind of realism that looks at life with the eye of science, has revealed so few situations or characters that are memorable for balance or sanity, though the work, I gather from what Mr. Stone says, has been done among a people and in an environment congenial to Faulkner's taste.

Granted his world, Faulkner has written some powerfully dynamic novels in which he has manifested an inten-

sity and subtlety of execution to be marvelled at. I have in mind especially *Absalom, Absalom!,* which surpasses his fine psychological presentation of the character of Joe Christmas in *Light in August* or the horrible impotent developed in *Sanctuary.* Into the creation of Colonel Tom Sutpen has gone an intensity of purpose comparable to that which Andrew Lytle used in the creation of Pleasant McIvor in *One Long Night.* But it is a hopeless people in *Absalom, Absalom!* (the living feeding on ghostly memories in a spirit of cruel vengeance or with a sense of impending doom), and it is a hopeless picture of the future, for the Jim Bonds (a mixed breed) "are going to conquer the western hemisphere." Four years after *Absalom, Absalom!,* with other books between, came *The Hamlet,* which is a study of the Snopes family—its rise to economic power in the person of Flem Snopes, at Frenchman Bend, which formerly had been an antebellum plantation. Readers who know Kay Boyle's "His Idea of a Mother" will find in *The Hamlet,* in addition to the usual horrors of attempted rape and committed murder, bovine affection of another order!

In addition to the realistic treatment of the Southern scene so far noted, there is a realism of another order. Among the novels of purpose in which the elements of naturalism are portrayed with cinematic vividness, the best example is John Steinbeck's *The Grapes of Wrath.* The author has avoided the ostensibleness of his purpose by the unique method of spacing expository chapters among the chapters of his narrative, these chapters functioning somewhat like the chorus in a Greek tragedy. Characters like Preacher Jim Casy do philosophize, but it is done in character, and is, therefore, harmonized with the overtones of the whole tragic story. Real artistry is shown in Steinbeck's treatment of a disentegrating family

which has been uprooted by the mechanizing processes of modern industry, by the forces of nature, and by men of economic power with a brutal lust for profits. By focusing attention upon Ma Joad, and portraying her tragic but futile efforts to keep the family together, Steinbeck has achieved artistic unity in spite of any ulterior motives that might have engendered his fundamental purpose. In short, whatever thesis he may have had in mind has been kept strictly subordinate to the unfolding of a powerful human drama. He has avoided Stribling's itch to prove a case and Caldwell's burlesque exaggerations.

There are other realists interpreting the people of the South, in the light of their customs and manners, with a fine regard for the qualities that one calls human. These realists have no special cause to plead; there is no axe to grind—there is no chip on the shoulder. Such a realist was Elizabeth Maddox Roberts when she wrote about the Chesser family in *The Time of Man* (1926). Since then has appeared Caroline Miller's *Lamb In His Bosom,* a story dealing with "poor whites" in the years 1840-65. The story unfolds quietly, and moves along with unquickened tempo. Miss Miller's treatment of the human drama of love, marriage, birth, growth, struggle, old age, and death seems as natural as the pines and swamps where the lives of Cean, Lonzo, their children and kin unfold in harmony with the eternal laws of nature. And there is the story of Brainard Cheyney's *Lightwood,* dealing with Micajah Corn and his sons, poor squatters of Southern Georgia a little after the Civil War, struggling with noble dignity to live their lives free from the exploitation of man and in peace with God and nature. Add to these *Hold Autumn In Your Hand* by George Sessions Perry who tells the story of a poor wages farmer, Sam Tucker, with his wife Nora, and grumbling Granny, fighting to get somewhere,

win a footing, in the black bottoms of Texas. And one must not overlook Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, who, in her short stories (*When the Whippoorwill—*, 1940), and in her novels, *South Moon Under* (1933) and *The Yearling* (1938), dealing with the poor whites of the scrub regions of Florida, has become perhaps the best exponent of true realism in Southern literature.

As examples of an honest, sincere, realistic treatment of material, suffused with human meaning and handled with balance and sanity, Mrs. Rawlings' stories are superb. She has done beautiful work in her treatment of the Florida cracker. Such short stories as "A Crop of Beans" and "Jacob's Ladder," and her two novels, *South Moon Under* and *The Yearling,* contain memorable characters and situations that are real in the truest sense of the word. Her characters are patterned after life itself. And the life that they led was oftentimes one of bitter struggle and heartaches; it was a life they had to meet on its own terms, an exacting life indeed. The pattern of that life Mrs. Rawlings has described in a passage in *South Moon Under:*

> But if the road had been hard, it was also pleasant. If a living was uncertain, and the sustaining of breath precarious, why, existence took on an added value and a greater sweetness. The tissues of life were food and danger. These were the warp and woof, and all else was an incidental pattern, picked out with varicoloured wools. Love and lust, hate and friendship, grief and frolicking, even birthing and dying, were thin grey and scarlet threads across the sun-browned, thick and sturdy stuff that was life itself. The old women sat together with bare, translucent faces, knowing that the pulse of blood through the veins was a rich, choice thing, and the drawing of a breath was good.

All the elements that a false realism would distort into an unreal picture may be found in Mrs. Rawlings' stories.

But she has the genius and the good sense to see life steadily and to see it whole. Her best work is perhaps *The Yearling*—the study of a boy and his love for an animal, and, not to be overlooked, the study of a father—a poor white—which is done with great love and tenderness and a fine regard for the dignity of human nature. Take the following scene which occurs between Penny and his son Jody. When the yearling had been killed, Jody had run away from home, his heart full of bitterness toward his parents, for they had been responsible for the death of his pet. Jody has just returned.

Penny studied him.

He said, "You've done come back different. You've takened a punishment. You ain't a yearlin' no longer. Jody—"

"Yes, sir."

"I'm goin' to talk to you, man to man. You figgered I went back on you. Now there's a thing ever' man has got to know. Mebbe you know it a'ready. 'Twa'n't only me. 'Twa'n't only your yearlin' deer havin' to be destroyed. Boy, life goes back on you."

Jody looked at his father. He nodded.

Penny said, "You've seed how things goes in the world o' men. You've knowed men to be low-down and mean. You've seed ol' Death at his tricks. You've messed around with ol' Starvation. Ever' man wants life to be a fine thing, and a easy. 'Tis fine, boy, powerful fine, but 'tain't easy. Life knocks a man down and he gits up and it knocks him down agin. I've been uneasy all my life."

His hands worked at the folds of the quilt.

"I've wanted life to be easy for you. Easier'n 'twas for me. A man's heart aches, seein' his young uns face the world. Knowin' they got to git their guts tore out, the way his was tore. I wanted to spare you, long as I could. I wanted you to frolic with your

yearlin'. I knowed the lonesomeness he eased for you. But ever' man's lonesome. What's he to do then? What's he to do when he gits knocked down? Why, take it for his share and go on."

Jody said, "I'm 'shamed I runned off."

Penny sat upright.

He said, "You're near enough growed to do your choosin'. Could be you'd crave to go to sea, like Oliver. There's men seems made for the land, and men seems made for the sea. But I'd be proud did you choose to live here and farm the clearin'. I'd be proud to see the day when you got a well dug, so's no woman here'd be obliged to do her washin' on the seepage hillside. You willin'?"

"I'm willin'."

"Shake hands."

In these stories by Mrs. Rawlings and others, it seems to me that we have, without any sacrifice of honesty and frankness, a realistic picture of people and folkways in the South that must not be forgotten when one appraises the Southern scene. A gallery of idiots, murderers, rapists, perverts, hypocrites, and shiftless dullards should not be the sole concern of any novelist who wants to look at and portray life in a realistic manner. Abnormal people and situations are found everywhere; they are not unique in the South.

The final word of this essay perhaps should revert to the implications of its title: Down in Dixie—But Not Out. The last decade has shown that a new spirit is at work in Dixie. The studies that Southerners are making of our socio-economic problems are indicative of the fact that we are substituting an intellectual for an emotional interest in what concerns the welfare of our people, and out of this civilized interest there is promise of greater days ahead.

We must not let ourselves be misled by those who preach a gospel of impending doom or paint "realistic" pictures of a decadent social order. We have our problems but we are not unique in that respect, today or yesterday. We also must not let ourselves be overwhelmed by a sense of futility. We are not as hopeless as statistics and some of the realistic novelists and photographers make out that we are. Of course, we are terribly troubled at the present time with seemingly insoluble problems. But people the world over are having their troubles too. Just now men everywhere are in the midst of a revolution; an old order is passing and a new one is being born. Birth pangs are being felt in Dixie as elsewhere in the world. It is the law of nature that out of the pains of birth springs always and continually life, and ever new life.

SOCIAL RESEARCH has been the chief interest of RUPERT B. VANCE. He is author of eight books concerning the Southern Region and its prospects. His publications include: *Human Factors in Cotton Culture, Regional Reconstruction for the South, The South's Place in the Nation,* and *Rural Relief and Recovery.* His volume, *Human Geography of the South,* is a sourcebook for those interested in the more individualized human elements of the Southern problems so often spoken of in abstractions.

Dr. Vance is a member of the 1920 graduating class of Henderson-Brown. He was graduated from Vanderbilt in 1921 with the M.A. degree, and in 1928 he received the Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina. Hendrix conferred upon him the LL.D. in 1938. Although he spent some years, prior to his attendance at the University of North Carolina, as a high school superintendent and as an instructor in South Georgia College, McRae, Georgia, he has been primarily a research scholar. Since 1929 he has devoted his time to doing research for the National Resources Commission, the Social Security Board, the Rosenwald Fund, and the Social Science Research Council. From 1935 to 1937 he served as secretary-treasurer of the Social Science Research Council, and in 1938 he was made president of the Council. Since 1937 he has been in residence at the University of North Carolina as Research Professor in the Institute for Research in Social Science.

In the following article, "The Human Resources of the Southern Regions," Dr. Vance has brought together data concerning the Southern lag in the development of her human resources.

THE SOUTH'S HUMAN RESOURCES IN TOTAL DEFENSE

RUPERT B. VANCE

Institute for Research in Social Science
University of North Carolina

IN ITS natural resources and in its human resources the American South, one of the great regions of the world, possesses unrealized capacity for economic and cultural development. Natural resources and human resources, it must be realized, are potential—not absolute. They are to be estimated in terms not of their existence but of their availability and development. Natural resources are not made available apart from the skills, the needs, and the demands of men, organized for their utilization. Human resources if left unutilized deteriorate. Left untrained, unskilled, and undisciplined, modern man would grow up unable to make the adjustments demanded in our complex civilization and economy. Unemployed or delayed in the adjustment to the job, to marriage and family life, and to community responsibilities, youth itself will develop traits of disorganization and deterioration.

The first duty of a nation is to survive; and out of our need for protection and defense in a war-torn world has come the demand for full utilization of our unused resources of materials and man power. Foremost among these resources can be placed the man power of the South. It is the purpose of this essay to discuss the utilization of the region's human resources in relation to our need for total defense.

Necessary to the rearmament of this country is the expansion of industrial production to a scale undreamed

of before the first World War. The plans and methods by which this expansion is accomplished will determine whether the South is to develop its natural and human resources at home or to export them to other regions. If the allocation of large defense orders should bring about an overexpansion of our most highly industrialized areas, large population movements may be expected to flow from the less developed areas of the agricultural Southeast. Certainly it seems desirable and it should be feasible to plan the development of industrial activity under the defense program so that it will occasion the least possible dislodgement of our population. If care is not taken to this end we will be faced, after the emergency has passed, with the problem of redistributing uprooted populations.

There accordingly exist two potential dangers in the present trend: one, that the countryside may be stripped of its settled population; the other, that an untoward degree of population congestion may be induced in established metropolitan areas.

The probable effect to be feared from the overstimulation of our more industrialized areas at the expense of those less developed may be seen by comparing population movements from 1920-1930 with those from 1930-1940. During the decade of the 1920's, expanding industrialism in the Northeast areas drew great streams of population from the undeveloped agricultural areas. The great depression left much of this population stranded and the decade of the 1930's was devoted to undoing much of the work of population redistribution done in the 1920's. Great cities failed to gain at previous rates, many lost population, and population piled up in the southeastern and western areas. Growth of cities continued in the Southeast at a rate higher than in the nation as a whole, although at a lesser rate than in 1920-1930. With our present knowledge

of the social costs of unnecessary mobility and of the relief costs of stranded urban populations, it seems clear that we should so plan the defense program as to offer the minimum disturbance to the nation's prevailing pattern of population distribution.

The type of industrial expansion best calculated to fit defense needs and to provide the minimum shock to our population pattern is that usually described under the term "decentralized industry." This should be true for both the permanent and the temporary industries set up under defense needs.

Many special defense industries may, at the conclusion of the emergency, have to be liquidated and their workers turned back into the general population. In areas of decentralized industry it is likely that such workers will keep their connection with the land and some may resume that status as full or part-time farmers. Being situated in a region of expanding industry, they should have a much better chance to find full-time employment. Undoubtedly the greater numbers of industrial units subject to expansion under the defense program will continue as part of our permanent industrial plant. Here decentralization, without decreasing either the population or economic activity of the metropolitan areas, will make for a better interregional balance of population and industry.

The Probable Trend of Migration from the Southeast

If an adequate national-regional policy in the location of industries is lacking, the South's contribution to future migration in this country is likely to be very large indeed. It is not difficult to show that the region's need is great and that the southern people are accustomed to moving in search of opportunity. In many respects our statistics on

internal migration are the poorest we have, but all the figures available show the tendency of the southern people to move. Previous migrations, Negro and white; the rural-urban drift; the high birth rate on southern farms; the number of southern youth who will mature into working population; the precarious agricultural situation in the Eastern Cotton Belt and the Southern Appalachian Mountains, all can be cited in support of this statement. Even during the depression much more migration would have taken place, in spite of the lack of opportunity, had it not been retarded by comparatively lower living standards and lower educational status of the southern common man. To these considerations must be added the effect of local and rural relief in keeping people located in their accustomed places.

In order to secure some idea of probable migration trends let us look at the record.

Population Movements to 1930

The people of the Southeast have taken part in three great migrations: one agricultural and two industrial. The first was the great movement to the free lands of the West, now a fit matter for the closed book of history. The second was the great interregional movement to industrial areas of the Northeast and Mid-West in which the Negroes took part. The third movement occurred in response to the trend toward interregional decentralization of industry and consisted of migration to the towns and cities rising in the New South. We may get some idea of the importance of the movement out of the region by using the state of birth data of the Census. For 1920 *Southern Regions* computed a net loss of 2,378,000 people by migration outside the Southeast. By 1930 this figure had grown to 3,412,000. Of the native born population of the United

States in 1930, it is calculated that 28,700,000 were born in the Southeast, of whom 24,100,000 were born in rural districts and 4,600,000 in the region's cities. Since only about 17,500,000 lived in the areas of their birth in 1930, it is evident that over 6,500,000 have moved elsewhere. Of these 3,800,000 have left the section entirely, while 2,900,000 have moved to southern cities. On the other hand, 400,000 came into the South from elsewhere leaving a net loss since birth of about 3,400,000.[1] These figures show how the rural South has continued its own growth, added to the growth of southern cities, and exported almost three and a half millions to the rest of the nation.

By 1930, 21.3 percent of the Negroes born in the South were living outside, a net loss of over 1,840,000 population. While the Negro exodus was more dramatic, it has been exceeded in numbers by the movements of the white population. By decades the net loss by migration of native whites from the Southeast has grown from a mere trickle of 21,000 in the 1870's to over a million in the 1920's. Over six decades this net loss has grown from 0.4 percent to 7.5 percent of the region's native white population.

Migration and Population Increase, 1930-1940

The decade 1930-1940 served to slow down and possibly to reverse migration from some southern areas. The 1940 Census indicates that the population of the region increased by 2,662,591 or 10.4 percent. This is the largest gain found in any region and a rate of increase that was exceeded only by the Far West. Vital statistics indicate that a 10.8 percent increase came through the excess of births over deaths in the Southeast. Accordingly, it can be calculated that the net loss by migration was only 88,634 or —0.4 percent. The Southeast's net gain of over 2,662,-

000 population exists as potential stimulus to renewed migration.

The trend of population movement toward industrial centers in the Southeast is indicated by the growth of cities in the region. From 1930 to 1940, population in cities of 10,000 and over gained 3.2 percent—or less—both in the Northeast and in the Middle States; in the Southeast the group showed a gain of 16.8 percent. From 1930 to 1940 the Southeast increased its proportion of the nation's population in cities of 10,000 and over from 8.6 to 10.7 percent. During this period the Northeast saw its share decline from 46.4 percent to 41.5 percent, and the Middle States declined from 30.8 to 29.7 percent. These figures suggest that, in contrast with densely settled areas, the Southeast continued its movement toward cities and industrialism throughout the depression. These trends suggest that whereas certain of our metropolitan regions have already attained their industrial maturity, the Southeast has the prospect of a reasonable expansion for some time to come. This conclusion is also indicated by the push out of agriculture in the area—a trend that is evident in the course of rural-urban migration.

Rural-Urban Migrations, 1920-1940

In order to arrive at figures on the year by year migration from southern farms to cities we must make use of the Department of Agriculture's annual estimates for the Census South, an area that includes Texas, Oklahoma, and certain border states. These figures indicate the greater number of births on southern farms and the great amount of urban migration necessary to hold the South's farm population at a stable level in a period of declining agriculture. From 1920 to 1939 annual births in southern farm areas have fallen from 500,000 to 450,000. For the

rest of the nation, farm births have never gone above 320,000. In the farm South annual deaths have not climbed over 200,000, which gives the farm population a natural increase that gradually fell from around 350,000 to 260,000 a year. For the rest of the nation, natural increase on farms has fallen from over 190,000 to about 100,000.

These figures indicate the forces back of heavy rural-urban migration in the South. They are not interregional, for they represent migration to towns and cities in the region as well as outside. They are valuable in indicating how impossible it will be to stop the South's rural-urban drift under our present economy. There is not sufficient demand for farm products nor sufficient land, good, poor, and indifferent, to provide for the increasing population. Certainly the figures cast doubt on the ability of southern areas to retain all their population increase without a better interregional balance of industry with agriculture.

Increases in the Population of Working Age, 18 to 65

On the basis of present trends in births and deaths it can be shown that without migration the farm population in the Southeast would grow from 12,766,000 in 1930 to 19,960,000 by 1960, an increase of over 7,200,000 people.[2] With migration continued as in the period 1920 to 1930, the farms of the Southeast would find their population declining from 12 3/4 millions to 11.5 millions. In order to avoid assumptions about what will happen to the birth rate, T. J. Woofter has calculated the additions that will be made to our labor force, those aged 18-65 by 1950. This potential working population 18-65 is now increasing at the rate of over a million a year. Seven-tenths of these new workers come from rural families. Allowing for deaths, for those reaching the retirement age of 65, the United States will have by 1950, 5.6 million more urban,

7.3 million more rural farm, and 4.1 million more rural nonfarm people of working age than in 1930.

For the Southeast in 1930 the annual increase in the farm population of the productive ages was 90,662, an increase of over 3 percent as compared to only 3/4 of 1 percent for the Far West. Twelve states of the South and two of the Great Plains have annual replacement rates in the productive ages of 2.67 percent or more. Three northeastern states have rates of zero or below. Of the nation's additional 7 1/3 million rural farm populations 18-65 by 1950, it is found that over 3,200,000 will come from the Southeast unless migration draws them away. These people, it must be realized, are already born; and the only thing likely to keep them from maturing into productive population, working or seeking work, is an increase in the death rate.

In the nation, total population 18-65 will grow from 73 million to almost 91 million. If 1930 conditions of employment should prevail, approximately only 2.9 percent of that group will be unemployed. But if conditions uncovered by the Special Unemployment Census of 1937 prevail, 12.2 percent will be unemployed and looking for work. The difference amounts to 8 1/2 million more unemployed. By now we know that one effect of loss of jobs is to force other members of the family to look for work, thus increasing the unemployed. If 1930 conditions should prevail in 1950, 35.6 million of those 18-65 will not seek gainful employment. Should the conditions of 1937 prevail, only 31.3 million will be out of the labor market. Thus 4.3 million more would be seeking work.

The bearing of these trends on future migration should be evident. If economic expansion under the defense program is limited to the already heavily industrialized areas of the Northeast and Middle States, those

areas may expect a tremendous invasion from the agricultural South.

Migration and the Economic Future

Barring further industrialization in the Southeast, what influence is the economic future likely to exert on migration? We know that the Southeast has two great problem areas in the old Cotton Belt and its Appalachian Mountains. As a result of the war they have been joined by a third problem zone—the Tobacco Belt. The South can grow cotton and lots of it for a price and a market. The market is vanishing before our eyes; and the price is held up only by the support of governmental operations. In 1938 we grew 18 1/4 million bales, sold 5 2/3 million abroad, consumed 5 3/4 million, and had a carry-over of 11 1/2 million bales. In 1939 by heroic efforts we reduced production to 11 2/3 million bales, sold only 3 1/3 million, used 6 4/5, and carried over 13 million bales. What if we reduced production to the annual take of 9 million bales; or, worse, to the domestic consumption of less than 7 million bales. We reduced cotton production to 9 2/3 million bales in 1934-1935 and, in spite of government checks, it nearly killed the southern farmer.

Those who would estimate the possible future migration out of the Cotton Belt will have to tell us what policies the government will adopt toward the cotton surplus, what other paying crops the South can grow, what other methods of using the land we can employ beside cotton tenancy and share cropping. The war, with its probable outcome, has made the agricultural question loom much larger and darker in outlook than the old familiar problem of recovering foreign markets. Unless the Southeast makes some progress toward increased industrialization at the same time it continues efforts toward

agricultural reconstruction, the pressure toward migration will be great indeed. The government's problem of supporting the market by loans finds us with a carry-over of 13 million bales in 1939 as compared to only 9 2/3 million bales in the depths of the crisis in 1932. Any drastic reductions of cotton production will, no doubt, force new displacements of population, but the government's program of carrying the crop of loans can hardly be justified without further reduction in quotas.

The problems of the Southern Appalachians result from the pressure of the nation's fastest growing population upon diminishing resources of timber lands, coal mining, and limited farm lands. Here are areas that at present birth and death rates will double their population every thirty years, without migration. Further industrialization or migration furnish the alternatives, for there is no additional land supply in this area that will not quickly erode if put to the plow. Regrowing timber is a long-time job not likely to offer early returns for the present generation except in government employment for conservation. Only the bituminous coal mines of Kentucky can produce more than they are now producing. Here is a problem of markets which war activity may somewhat increase.

Industrialization of the South

What the South needs is to adjust a decreasing rate of population growth to an increasing utilization of its regional resources. No area more desperately needs the products of an industrial civilization than the South, and hardly any population has cheaper products to offer in exchange than our surplus cotton and low-priced raw materials. Industrialization of the South will help to supply the South's needs much more than the industrialization of any other area. Only as the region increases in orderly

industrial development will the pressure toward migration be relaxed.

Adequate solution of our economic problems will come through expanding employment, expanding industrialization, expanding trade, and expanding consumption, not by one region taking the industries from another region. Leon Henderson has estimated that for all the South's population to secure the income necessary to purchase what is usually considered an American standard of living, would provide the nation with a new market worth ten billion dollars a year. The gain would be worth very little, however, if it meant the loss of an equivalent amount of employment in the rest of the country.

The industrialization of the South is slowly being accomplished. The question is often asked: What will it mean to the region? A study of the Catawba River Basin, the first river valley to be electrified in the Southeast, suggests some possibilities of this development. Instead of being concentrated in great cities, much of the industrial population of the Carolina Piedmont lives in small cities, towns, and even in the open countryside. Less necessary in these days of municipal and federal housing projects, the paternalistic mill village with its company housing, many feel, is a passing phenomenon. Agriculture has changed as the rise of industries and cities opened new markets for food, fruit, dairy, and truck products. Along with this went the development of part-time farming. Farmers supplemented their incomes by working in near-by industries, and industrial workers moved out to farm homes where they could keep a cow and a garden. Without developing any great cities, this area increased its proportion of industry, gained in population, and improved its type of agriculture. As workers gained more skill and as investment and size of plants grew larger, efficiency and productivity

increased. With federal standards and increased unionization, the wage level began to approach nearer that of the nation. While some feel that the increased costs may slow down the rate of industrialization, others feel that the new development will have a more permanent foundation.

Most people now realize that the South's population cannot continue to work in agriculture to the extent it once did when 60 percent of our cotton and much of our tobacco was sold abroad. Yet industrialization has both its gains and losses; and not all the changes have meant social advantages. Certainly outside the immediate area the prospect of the industrialization of the South is more feared than welcomed. With the country's other agricultural needs well supplied by other regions, the South's insistent cry for a higher standard of living can be answered only by an expanding industrial production in which its workers take part. This need will be emphasized all the more when the emergency comes to an end and the defense program tapers off.

FOOTNOTES

1. Howard W. Odum, *Southern Regions of the United States.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936. p. 436.
2. These figures are based on W. S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, *Estimates of Future Population by States.* Washington, D. C., 1934.

THE ACADEMIC training of JOHN ROY STEELMAN has been in the fields of sociology and economics; his career has been built in the more specialized field of labor problems. Dr. Steelman received his A.B. degree from Henderson-Brown in 1922. Leaving Henderson-Brown, he went to Vanderbilt with a scholarship to study in the Department of Sociology. Vanderbilt awarded him the M.A. degree in 1924 and the Ph.B. degree in 1925. He spent the following academic year in study at Peabody. Then in 1926 he became an instructor and graduate student at Harvard. He concluded his academic training in 1928 when he received, after several years' study in the Departments of Sociology and Economics at the University of North Carolina, the Ph.D. degree from that university.

From 1928 until 1933 Dr. Steelman was professor of economics and sociology at Alabama College, Montevallo, Alabama. In 1933 he was called to Washington as one of the commissioners in the labor conciliation service. He served in that capacity until 1936 when he was made special assistant to the Secretary of Labor. Since 1937 Dr. Steelman has been Director of the United States Conciliation Service. The special nature of his duties as Director of the Conciliation Service has given him the responsibility of seeking adjustments of labor disputes before they become sensational or disrupting to industry.

Dr. Steelman has said, "The successful functioning of democracy depends primarily upon harmonious relations between those who work and those who direct work." His essay, "Industry—A Way of Life," presents his recommendations for the development of that harmony in Southern industry.

INDUSTRY - A WAY OF LIFE

JOHN ROY STEELMAN
Director, United States Conciliation Service

DEMOCRACY, we are told, is on trial today. Hasn't it always been since the birth of our nation and democracy's earliest budding?

It has long seemed to me that most of us have given too little thought to an extremely pertinent and oft-repeated apprehension of one of our most realistic philosophers, one of our earliest and most effective advocates of democracy.

There is no evidence that, in his adult years, Thomas Jefferson was ever concerned with the past, except as the lessons drawn from the past might be used to meet the present and to mold a better future. A sensitive man, a lover of the beautiful and the gracious, a friend and patron of artists, he nevertheless displayed (with the possible exception of Franklin) a keener and more sustained interest in mechanical advances and improvements than any of those others conspicuous on our dawning political scene. Whether at Monticello or abroad, the latest inventions received no less careful attention because of an absorption in architecture, gardening, music, politics, education, friends, and the management of a large estate and all its personnel.

Yet Jefferson feared industrialization—not for reasons of self-interest but out of deep and considered concern for the welfare of the great bulk of his fellow citizens.

Of course, no one in Jefferson's time could have foretold that the United States was to lead the world in techniques of mass production. We know that his fear was prompted largely by a knowledge of the abuses and grind-

ing squalor of certain stages of the industrial revolution on the other side of the Atlantic—abuses and, indeed, stages which were in the main happily to be avoided in our own country. We know that for America to have attempted to stem the tide of *her* industrial *evolution* would not only have been to stand in the way of one of the greatest potentialities of relief from want for the average man. In all probability, such an effort would have been doomed to failure. Even had this not been so, such dubious success as might have been attained would have been possible only by undemocratic (and thoroughly un-Jeffersonian) retraints upon the resourcefulness and energy of many generations of a vigorous, growing people.

Of course, the man who believed that that government is best which governs least did not contemplate any such course. No responsible publicist or statesman or party has ever done so in the United States. If we have steadily expanded our concepts of the sphere and influence and service of government, it has been only in conformity with the real meaning of the Jefferson credo—that government is best which governs least, *consistent with the welfare of an independent but interdependent citizenry.*

Our democracy has never attempted to stop or even to postpone progress. We have differed over means and over the execution of policy. But our policy itself has been to further progress to the utmost, and, at the same time, to do our best to alleviate such of the undesirable *concomitants* of progress as were brought most forcibly to our attention.

Progress, in America at least, has never been dissociated from industrial development and efficiency. Admittedly, almost all our social legislation has been designed to correct or to palliate hardships and temporary

dislocations flowing from industrialization. But almost all that legislation, where it has not been concerned with the protection of life and limb and liberty, has been directed toward enabling people to purchase a greater share of the *products* of industry. There has been no concrete proposal for helping any of our citizens to help themselves which has not been so directed.

We recognize, then, that, no matter what our individual occupations (commerce, industry, farming, teaching, healing the sick, preaching the Gospel, making a home—it seems futile to try to catalogue us in all our variousness), from industry itself must come many of the means toward a good and fuller life.

The South recognizes this—and has been doing something about it. From the first spindles set up by a venturesome few, plant after plant, company after company, with increasing and wholesome diversity, has been encouraged and helped to start out below the Mason-Dixon line. We know, of course, what was long the principal drawing card and that it boded no permanent good for the South. But today, added to the effects and influence of the Fair Labor Standards Act, we may observe a growing realization, which, well before the passage of that Act, was percolating down from some of the most efficient American managements that low wage *rates* are by no means synonymous with low labor *costs;* that, indeed, the two may be antithetical.

Business sees in the South of today too many tangible advantages to pay much attention to that economic will-o'-the-wisp of cheaper production through sweated labor.

As one raised in the South, I cannot but rejoice in the opportunities which increasing payrolls should mean to all Southerners, within and without industry—oppor-

tunities to partake more fully not only of the resources of the South but of those of other sections of the United States. I am concerned that the South utilize to the utmost the opportunities now opening before her. More specifically, I am concerned that she recognize and take a leading part in working out a problem visualized by Jefferson and now hounding the twentieth century world for a solution.

For Jefferson feared industrialization not because of the wealth it could produce. It is not on record that he regarded the production of wealth or the satisfaction of human wants as anything but desirable. He feared, rather, that industrialization and democracy were not compatible; that our very real and growing democracy would be endangered, if ever large groups of our people, as in western Europe, were herded comparatively propertyless together, in and nearby large industrial centers. He feared, in short, a "proletariat" in the Roman sense—people removed from the land, without roots or responsibility, with no real stake in the community and no feeling of "place" in the scheme of things.

The democracy he envisioned was a country composed primarily of independent farmers, working their own land, strong, self-reliant, owning no one as master except, perhaps, their duly elected political officials. A strange dream, we may think, for the master of Monticello. But he believed in it deeply and fervently and worked for it no less ardently. And he had this of realism for later generations of Americans—he held that there could be no genuine political democracy without some modicum of economic democracy.

We may say that Jefferson underestimated the toughness of the American democratic dream and the toughness and persistence of the men and women who were to follow it. I, for one, feel sure that he did.

I am sure also, however, that his political philosophy was based upon a keen discernment of human nature. He grasped, rather fully, I think, something which no leader of men can completely ignore without endangering his leadership—that most human beings, no matter how well or how ill they fare materially, have a need and longing to feel themselves part of some enterprise, to be vested with some responsibility or, at the very least, to *feel* that they are vested with some responsibility. Only thus can man feel himself dignified. And only the man who feels himself dignified can even approach his full efficiency in the political and economic world.

It was Jefferson's belief that industrial groups, crowded together in large cities, would not be able to attain or preserve that sense of dignity and responsibility; that they might at some time constitute a definite threat to the order and well-being of society; that, with a general outlook of "nothing to lose," they might fall easy prey to ambitious men who seemed to hold out to them the hope of "belonging" and of being an integral part of something.

That Jefferson was far from wholly wrong is attested by the rise and present dominance of totalitarianism in parts of our world. Yes, the symbols and purposes of totalitarianism are largely retrogression to the primitive. Yes, totalitarianism has been distinguished for inhumanly ruthless suppression of dissident and even merely *different* minorities. But it has exploited without stint all the means of communication which industrialism has made possible. And, what is more important, it has, at least in the countries of its origin, appealed to and exploited the unsatisfied yearnings of twentieth century men to "belong" to something and thus to feel both purpose and security.

The fact that "it" has not happened here and the hope that "it" will soon pass from the world does not remove

the challenge of Jefferson's apprehension to true lovers of democracy.

As I see it, insofar as the industrial growth of the South is concerned, that challenge extends to two principal fields. The first is community life and housing—man's social life in an extra-occupational sense. The second is the whole broad field of industrial relations—man's relation to his job, to his fellow workers, and to all the hierarchy of management. This distinction between the two fields is, of course, merely for purposes of simplification. In actual life they are not and never can be so sharply distinguished.

I am an expert on neither housing construction, nor architecture, nor community planning. Their details had best be left to others. I wish merely to draw attention to a few of the advantages of having industry decentralized as much as is economically feasible.

Comparative cheapness of land, lack of serious transportation problems, proximity to raw materials, and mildness of climate are not the only attractions to those of our industries which are growing up in the South or, already established elsewhere, are putting up branch after branch below the Mason-Dixon line. Of equal importance to the best of these enterprises, I think, are the broader socio-economic aspects of decentralization.

By this I imply some attention to the deep desire of most of our citizens to own their homes and the greater possibilities of realizing this desire outside the large urban centers; to the desire to be near the land and to have some patch of earth around the dwelling place; to the greater security which may be attained (especially for the employees of industries in which even the best management cannot do away with the seasonable element) through

food raising about the home; and, possibly most important of all, to the beneficent effects upon individuals and families when they have an opportunity, as in less crowded places they are more likely to have, to play some part in the life and government of the community.

I do not refer to paternalism. That has no permanent place in America. The paternalistic idea has one good point, however, and that is its recognition of the importance of extra-occupational or "leisure" hours and living upon job efficiency and the whole tone of industrial relations. How men and women feel about their jobs can depend upon all twenty-four hours of their day, seven days a week, and not merely upon their actual working hours.

Democratic industry does not attempt to control the "extra-curricular" activities of its people. But the importance of such activities, the effects which plant locale can have upon general living, must be recognized by any organization which hopes to tap the potentials of efficiency and cooperation to be found among its personnel.

I have stressed the question of plant location because, as I see it, the South has one main advantage over other sections of the country in striving to escape the evils of excessive concentration. By and large, she does not have to tear down, with all which that might mean in wholesale destruction of established land values and dislocation in many other fields of ownership, labor, and commerce.

But, even in a South making fullest use of her opportunities to "start clean" along this line, it is neither possible nor desirable that all industry be located at a distance from the larger centers. What is to be hoped is that, in weighing the relative advantages of different types of factory sites, increased businesslike attention will be given to the effects of any choice upon the living facilities avail-

able to employees and so upon the long-run development of industrial relations.

It is with that question of men and women in direct relation to their jobs that, naturally, I am primarily concerned.

Mr. Stuart Chase put it about as well as I know when he stated:

> A factory performs two major functions: the economic one of producing goods and the social one of creating and distributing satisfactions among the people under its roof.

It has been my experience that neither of these functions can be minimized without impairing performance of the other. And, as might be expected, where there has been minimization of one of these functions, the second has usually been the one to suffer initially. I think it was because of the almost complete disregard of this second or social function which he observed in the Europe of his day that Jefferson wished his own country to avoid industrialism.

That collective bargaining is necessary to the proper performance of this second function is one of my own strongest beliefs. That the South will make good use of the comparatively clear collective bargaining road stretching out before her is one of my fondest hopes.

I need not labor the points that opposition to the right to organize and bargain collectively was one of the most frequent causes of the bitterest disputes in America's industrial history; that such opposition, in spirit as well as in overt acts, is rapidly fading from our industrial scene; and that today, in even the most highly publicized and comparatively spectacular disagreements over the *subjects* of collective bargaining, there is to be found little of the

old-time bitterness so frequently apparent in disputes over the *question* of collective bargaining.

What *is* important is that the South appreciate and take advantage of: (1) Her own fortunate freedom from many of the old lingering prejudices; (2) The real meaning and purpose of collective bargaining; (3) What collective bargaining has to contribute to business efficiency.

He would be no true friend of the South who denied or tried to skim over the existence of prejudice against labor organizations and genuine collective bargaining below the Mason-Dixon line. As in the rest of the country, such prejudice once gave the tone to much management thinking. As in the rest of the country, such prejudice still lingers here and there.

There are several differences, however.

Much of the South's most significant industrial development has taken place in a period during which, throughout all the United States, such prejudice was steadily declining.

Of those Southern industries which were established prior to this period, many gave no active expressions of this prejudice, if only for the simple reason that they were not faced with what they might at that time have termed a "threat to organize." Thus there was less tendency for the growth of employee prejudices reciprocating those of management.

Finally, a great deal of the present expansion is starting up "clean"—with managers alert, *constructively aggressive,* and more or less devoid of prejudice and with workers whose lack of previous industrial training may be more than compensated for by freedom from so many of the misunderstandings to be found in older industrial sections and countries.

What these misunderstandings can mean in hindering full utilization of collective bargaining, both before and for some time after the commencement of the collective bargaining relationship, I have seen many times. They give to both sides an impression of conflict where there is no conflict. They discourage attention to facts and to the economics involved in a situation. They tend toward inordinate emphasis upon feelings, emotions, and personalities. They hinder and, once in a while, they prevent the solution of disagreements. They might almost be said to *breed* disagreements.

They are present in expanding Southern industry on what I consider a wholesomely small scale—too small, I hope, to hinder the development of employer-employee relations in a democracy which is committed overwhelmingly to the conduct of those relations on a collective bargaining basis.

But it is not enough that, by and large, the road to collective bargaining is unimpeded. If we are to use that road most advantageously (and with a minimum of "bumps"), we need clearer concepts of its meaning and purpose.

I have pointed out on many occasions that there are two general policies which a society may follow in regard to the labor relations problems of its units of production and distribution. These two policies are mutually exclusive.

The first is that of agreements voluntarily arrived at between management and labor. Here government intervenes only as friendly guide and adviser and only when necessary for the public interest and the interest of the parties themselves. This policy is inseparable from any system of free labor, free management, and responsible self-government. It is the labor relations policy not only of democracy but of efficiency.

The second policy is that of government's telling labor and management what to do—telling them what the terms of their agreements shall be. (Although, of course, there can never be real "agreement" under such circumstances, since there is no free meeting of minds.) This policy is the antithesis of democracy. It is everywhere one of the distinguishing marks of totalitarianism, which, with no free and basic community of interests, cannot afford even the slightest surface manifestation of disagreement.

For all its superficial smoothness, this policy, in contrast to that of democracy, is a hindrance and not a help to efficiency. Given the right tools and machinery, their most effective utilization depends upon the maximum expenditure of thoughtful effort. And that effort is not forthcoming without the element of volition—of consent and agreement.

Somewhat the same distinction can be made, I think, in respect to industrial relations within the individual enterprise. Here, also, there are two principal (and, to a great extent, mutually exclusive) methods which may be followed.

The first is that of having hours, wages, and working conditions determined by management fiat. Be it good or bad, what management says goes. If they do not like it, the workers may seek other employment. In practice, of course, it does not work out with such brusque simplicity. But here is the underlying spirit of human relations in an organization which has not accepted collective bargaining. It was perhaps best expressed by Andrew Carnegie when he stated:

> Now the poorest laborer in America or in England, or indeed throughout the civilized world, who can handle a pick or a shovel, stands upon equal terms with the purchaser of his labor. He sells it or with-

holds it as may seem best to him. He negotiates, and thus rises to the dignity of an independent contractor.

That statement was made in 1886, and Mr. Carnegie may actually have believed it.

The other method of conducting industrial relations within an enterprise is that of negotiation between the management and organization or organizations of employees—collective bargaining. This negotiation pertains only to wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Aside from this, it leaves all other phases of the business—marketing, purchase, accounting, design, etc.—to management discretion. It implies merely that the employees do together what they cannot do separately—negotiate freely as to the terms of their labor. It brings to the management-worker relation something of our all-important democratic element of consent.

It deals, of course, with economics. Woe unto either party which ignores the limitations imposed by costs, competitors in the same industry, competing industries, elasticity of consumer demand, comparative rigidity of customary price levels, and a host of other factors! What is too often overlooked, however, is that the way of collective bargaining, while it deals with questions of the price to be paid for labor, has implications and possibilities extending far beyond such questions.

No approach to labor relations which underemphasizes all the economic factors involved will meet with any lasting success. But every approach to those relations which fails to take into account that the best services of men and women are not, by the very nature of things, to be bought by money alone, will fall short of real accomplishment.

Even Carnegie recognized, in a way, the need that people feel the dignity of working because they want to

work. It remained for modern American personnel management to develop and emphasize this and to strive without let-up toward having people do things not because they *have* to but because they *want* to.

I do not believe that this can be achieved in modern industry without collective bargaining. What is needed is that people feel a "place" in the scheme and purpose of the enterprise in which they have invested their most precious possessions—their lives and labor. This feeling of place, for the good of the individuals and the good of the enterprise, must be of an active and not a passive nature. And, in its deepest sense, it can come only from active cooperation and not from the unilateral efforts of even the most high-minded and best-intentioned management.

It is true that, through collective bargaining, the worker achieves a fuller measure of security. It is only in rare cases, however, that this security has any semblance of protection of the inefficient or unwilling worker. Most American unions—and I think my experience entitles me to an observation on the point—simply will not stand for that sort of thing. "A fair day's work for a fair day's pay" is what both fellow workers and union officials expect from the man or woman in American industry.

It is not security against inefficiency but security for efficiency, which is the real intent and effect of the operation of collective bargaining. Seniority, for example, is not the strangulation of effort and initiative but the freeing of it through removal from the worker's mind of the haunting fear of loss of job and family support because of favoritism in one form or another. It is a notable fact that, during the depth of our great depression, output per man declined sharply in one industry after another. It had been thought in many quarters that productive efficiency

would rise steadily as job security decreased. Throughout the country, actual experience was quite the reverse of this.

Something of the same observation may be made with regard to the establishment and operation of grievance systems. For many years our best industrial executives sought means of assuring that every worker with a grievance or complaint would have a hearing—up to, if necessary, the head of the company. The idea was fine. The application of the idea was another matter. In almost every case, it bogged down because of apprehensions of the employees of reprisals by supervisors over whom they might appeal. The most plainly worded announcements of company policy and the sincerity and solicitude of the highest company officials did not avail against the employee feeling of lack of security.

Now his union and the agreement which it has negotiated give the employee this necessary sense of security. Given the establishment of good grievance machinery and the efficient operation of that machinery (and most of the unions I have ever known will work without stint to assure this), industry attains through collecting bargaining what it desired but could not attain alone. The effect on employee morale is obvious. Only when industry knows that the worker feels free to appeal any grievance straight up the whole ladder of management can industry feel sure that *he* feels sure of a square deal. And only when men feel sure of a square deal can they give themselves fully to the job at hand.

Nor can the effects of this on industrial peace as a whole be overlooked. It is a truism in labor relations that any feeling of resentment or unfair treatment (whether or not the feeling is justified by facts) contains the seeds of trouble. Allowed to smoulder undetected, such feeling

may spread throughout an organization and culminate, in time, in a stoppage of work. With the establishment and operation of grievance systems through collective bargaining, such possibilities are reduced to a minimum, to the mutual advantage of employer, employees, and the general public.

For American employees and employee organizations do not desire strikes and will usually resort to such action only when other means of securing legitimate grievance adjustments have been exhausted or when they cannot be used at all.

Indeed, many union-management agreements provide for arbitration as the final step in handling grievances. That is, machinery is set up for management and labor to work toward adjustment themselves. Then in the interest of avoiding any stoppage of operations, it is provided in advance that, if an adjustment over any grievance (or over a dispute as to the meaning or application of the contract itself) cannot be developed by this means, some third and neutral party shall be designated as arbitrator. The decision of the arbitrator is to be final and binding, of course, upon both parties. More than sixty-two per cent of the management-labor agreements on file in my office now provide for arbitration in some form.

But these are only a few of the more obvious contributions of collective bargaining to industrial peace and to operating efficiency. They may be only a beginning, as experience has shown in some industries and companies where collective bargaining as a way of man-to-man relationship has become firmly established.

I have said that collective bargaining itself is directly concerned only with wages, hours, and working conditions and that all other questions remain a subject of manage-

ment discretion. That is true. It does not mean, however, that labor cannot help management on many of its problems, especially those of production. I know of many instances where labor organizations, recognized gladly (and not reluctantly) as vital, functioning parts of industry, are almost every day effecting tangible, calculable, dollars and cents savings in operating costs.

Labor, for example, is naturally averse to the wholesale introduction of technological improvements when those improvements are introduced in such a manner as to cause people to be thrown on the street. And yet I know of cases where, given protection by management-labor agreement against this, employee organizations have devoted time and thought and *money* to the joint conduct of research programs to reduce operating costs. Sometimes the reduction achieved has been comparatively small—but well in excess of the cost of the program. In more than a few cases, however, the annual savings have run into six figures. And the programs are still going on.

In every one of these cases of which I write, the initial suggestion and plans for the program were volunteered by the workers. They had their assurance of fair play, they had their assurance of as much security as management could possibly give them, they had the protection of their union and of their contract with management. They had, in short, their *security for efficiency*. And they felt that they had a stake, a "place," in the enterprise. So they set out to do what all normal people want a chance to do—to give the best they had to the organization to which they belonged.

Such instances (and they are quietly multiplying throughout the United States) are compelling proof that, in a democracy, there is no basic conflict of interest

between management and labor. They are proof, too, for any who need it, that the normal person wishes to *give* as well as to *get*—and will do so gladly if given half a chance. And they are proof that our democratic way of free collective bargaining is good, sound business.

Most important of all, for a world in which democracy seems to be at the crossroads, they show us our pattern of reconciliation between the democratic dream which Jefferson fought for and the industrialism which he feared.

If that dream is to endure through the twentieth century and beyond, if we in America are to keep it alive as a light of hope and faith for other less fortunate lands and peoples, then, in all the places where American citizens toil, we must give to it tangible substance.

That she be in the vanguard for this our task of *industrial* democracy, just as in Jefferson's day she gave leadership so brilliantly and in such full measure for the establishment of our *political* democracy, is my strongest wish for the South.

MATT LOCKE ELLIS was named valedictorian of the 1921 graduating class of Henderson-Brown. Graduation brought no departure, however, for he was retained on the campus as assistant professor of physics, 1921-1923. As both teacher and scholar, he spent the next ten years alternately teaching at Henderson-Brown and continuing his graduate study at Yale. In 1925 he received the M.A. degree from Yale, and the following academic year he became associate professor of philosophy and Bible at Henderson-Brown. He held that position until the opening of the fall quarter in 1931. At that time he returned to Yale University where he completed his work for the doctorate in 1933. In September of 1933 he began his duties as full professor of philosophy at Henderson, then Henderson State Teachers College. He became Dean of the College in 1934. He served one year in that capacity and then accepted his opportunity at Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas, where he is Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Library.

The essay presented here is his answer to many questions which have puzzled minds more and less philosophical than his. One of the questions which he answers concerns the bases for moral action in a world led by science. Another concerns the compatibility of science and Christianity.

A QUEST FOR FOUNDATIONS

MATT L. ELLIS
Director of the Library and Professor of Philosophy
Hendrix College

ONE DAY in a class at Arkadelphia, Dr. Benjamin S. Foster turned to a student and asked, "Mr. ——, what is the difference between you and a brick?" On many other days, in various ways, year after year, this "grand old man of Henderson" emphasized the point. "What is man?" is always a central question; on the answers we express hinge life's perspective, meaning, value.

With unusual significance the query arises in a time of frustration, when the plans of men have gone wrong. In our day, when basic changes, wrought out peacefully in some lands and amid terrific conflict in others, have left no life untouched, society finds itself in acute distress; things are going badly; men are called upon to endure hardships, to face political and economic disillusionment. Fully bewildered by the situation in which life is set, they may wonder: Is human nature capable of controlling its own destiny? Is man a piece of nature, a product of it, caught in the chaotic forces that are around him? Or, is he, as human, more than and transcending the "natural"?

The question is part of a larger inquiry. Another great teacher put it in this fashion: If we could ask of some all-knowing mind one question, and only one, with the promise that the true and complete answer would be forthcoming, what would be our question? Some riddle of science—the mystery of chlorophyll, whether living tissue can be created in test tubes, the full meaning of the electron, the explanation of heredity? Some interest of human welfare—the control of unemployment; immunity from disease; the solution of the race relations problem in the

educational, political, and economic life of the South; the eradication of poverty from the world, the permanently peaceful organization of the nations of men? No, none of these, said Dr. J. Crosby Chapman of Yale; we would, if wise, strike more deeply at the mysteries of life. Is the universe friendly? Is there a purpose working itself out in the world of nature and in the lives of men? Are values in any sense ultimate and primary? Is the basis of moral distinction, in the last analysis, to be found in the world order? Are the thoughts and feelings and actions of men "but the impotent sparks that fly from the anvil of the forces of creation," or may they significantly affect, for better or worse, the realization of the world's purpose? Does belief in man as akin to God make any real difference?

In a world of revolutionary change, one may inquire: Why this question? The world's work is carried on for the most part by men and women of practical affairs for whom concern for literature, the arts, and philosophy is simply irrelevant. Tyranny and war, waste and incompetence, intolerance and misunderstanding, poverty and ignorance—are not these more pressing problems in a trying day, when many feel that "everything nailed down is coming loose"?

We always have the challenge of needs, definitely and unmistakably. Food, shelter, clothing, the material requirements of the good life in a dual world of "haves" and "have-nots," present grave problems in situations leaving much to be desired. But man also has, because he has moved beyond the narrow areas of animal life, that which Overstreet has called "the challenge of the unknowns."[1] Man is an animal, predatory, deceitful, cruel. But he is no less incurably a social, responsible, aspiring animal. He longs for a city with foundations.

In the process of the quest for a city, the manner in which man meets the challenge of the unknowns cannot be unrelated to the manner in which he meets the challenge of material needs. For, "ideas are weapons"; the "point of view" is important even in a world of blitzkrieg, luftwaffe, and bewildered minds. Dictators respect the strength of men's philosophies; this is a fact to which eloquent testimony is given by the hard realities of the present. In the prisons, the concentration camps, in the graves of the world's newest autocracies, and in exile from their borders, are thousands of non-conformists. Reshufflings of the nations of Europe, far-reaching conflict and upheaval of established people, but make more pressing the basic problem of human life.

II

Each age has, in a sense, its own attitude toward the world, its own intellectual problems, its own ways of solving them. Changes in men's thought lead to varied "winds of doctrine" concerning the meaning of life and the nature of the universe; new conceptions and beliefs, in the race as in the individual, displace old ones of another day. The record of these experiences and the interpretative evaluation of the factors in pervasive shifts of thinking form the story of human thought.

Viewing this development, the classification of any particular period is determined by the point of view which dominates its written page, and the page both influences and is influenced by the general temper of the day. It is not surprising that in our tough-minded age, marked by the triumphs of technological pursuits, many men have grown tired of the old disputes in thought and, in their weariness, have insisted that efforts be concentrated upon the more feasible tasks of exploring factual conditions—

physical, biological, psychological, social, political, economic—upon which the practical life of an individual, a community, a culture, depends. The problem of the living, as these conceive it, is the discovery of methods for the effective accomplishing of an increasingly better adaptation in a precarious world.

Following this lead, the modern world has turned away from its traditional disciplines and is moving toward naturalism. But a view's domination of any time is at most only control; it is never complete possession. The old issues abide and the differences that characterize the great systems continually reappear. Conflicting views of thought, like competing political organizations, are compelled to meet the thrusts and onslaughts of their opponents; the "outs" will never leave the "ins" in unguarded peace, in fact, will not always concede that the "ins" are in. But as government is doubtless more responsible because of the eternal vigilance of warring political parties, so also much progress in other fields of thought has come through the interchange of ideas among opposed camps.

It has ever been so. For in every age since man first began to speculate about the meaning of the universe and his place in it, two large points of view in clear antithesis have been expressed. The Great Tradition, friendly toward religion and eternal values, has, from Socrates and Plato to the contemporary idealists, been arrayed against the Lesser Tradition, to which has belonged that long line from Protagoras and Democritus to the behaviorists, mechanists, and positivistic naturalists of the present day.

The Lesser Tradition, Berkeley in the eighteenth century characterized in his Alciphron as "the minute philosopher." The minute philosophers are, he says, "a sort of sect which diminish all the most valuable things, the

thoughts, views, and hopes of men; all the knowledge, notions, and theories of the mind they reduce to sense; human nature they contract and degrade to the narrow, low standard of animal life, and assign us only a small pittance of time instead of immortality."[2] Bertrand Russell, in sympathy with the minute philosopher, forty years ago expressed the case in this way: "That Man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and that the whole temple of Man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of a universe in ruins—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand."[3]

But the Great Tradition answers with Pascal: It may be that "Man is but a reed, the most feeble thing in nature; but he is a thinking reed. The entire universe need not arm itself to crush him. A vapor, a drop of water suffices to kill him. But if the universe were to crush him, man would still be more noble than that which killed him, because he knows that he dies and the advantage which the universe has over him; the universe knows nothing of this."[4] Thinking, man may be conscious of "the vista of eternity, and the resonance of a divine concern in inward vitality."[5]

III

The most popular American philosophies, it can scarcely be doubted, are characterized by their faith in the

conclusions and methods of natural science. Mind, which played the leading role in the past, is subordinated to mere practical ends, sometimes indeed pushed completely out of the picture. Behavioristic method has forced purpose, if not to give up the ghost, to become, like complex and instinct, just a particular neural set or tendency of the organism. For modern positivists the chief emphasis in all philosophical undertaking is the genetic method; things are to be understood through their origins and functions; they are what they can do and what can be done with them.

In John Dewey this spirit of open revolt against philosophia perennis is perhaps most independent and far-reaching. For him, language, knowledge, truth, meaning, values, are resultant effects of the interaction of organism with environment. Mind is, like physical organs, the outcome of favorable variations occurring in natural selection, and is itself a part of nature functioning as a tool of adjustment and adaptation. Criteria and standards are genetically developed out of the social life and are products of the operational method (operating, participating, manipulating, experimenting) which is, according to this view, "the supreme value."[6]

For Dewey the quest for certainty is a futile and vain quest and should be renounced in favor of a concern for security through control of conditions, the only security man may know. Too long has man allowed the "traditional" to hold him back. Primitive man's dualism between the ordinary and the extraordinary, connected as it was with the "lucky" and the "holy," and various rites and ceremonies, incantations and spells, became the inheritance of Greek thought and found expression in their dualisms between the sensible and the real, the natural and the supernatural. Western culture, in Europe and America, has retained intact the traditional ideas of

the Greeks. The Great Tradition, which to men like W. M. Urban is at once the genius and the salvation of human thought, has no such meaning for Dewey, to whom its expression in the perennial reappearance of the "eternals" into the philosophical writings of every age and nation is but a reflection of the ultrasentimentalism and the unscientific attitude which bar man's progress.[7]

The scope of Dewey's broad criticism is astounding. The special object of his attack is the view of man as "spectator," the assumption that what is known is antecedent to inquiry, the premise that "the real object is the object so fixed in its regal aloofness that it is kind to any beholding mind that may gaze upon it."[8] This "spectator" theory seems to be charged against nearly everybody—the Sophists of ancient Greece, Plato and Aristotle, Rationalists and Empiricists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Kant and Hegel, the later Idealists of the nineteenth century, all thinkers down to the eve of the positivistic revolution, and even Realists and Idealists of contemporary time.

There are several aspects here into which we might with profit inquire. It is fairly obvious to common sense that the essential human quest is for meaningful, and to some degree satisfying, life. In this philosophy which Dewey calls empirical naturalism, or naturalistic empiricism, or naturalistic humanism,[9] what is the meaning of "experience"? It can perhaps best be seen in the light of Dewey's attempt to resolve a number of dualisms: personal and impersonal, experience and nature, method and subject-matter.

1. Ordinarily, we think of experience as the historic achievement of finite individuals, persons. We often hear the expression, "school of experience," and in orthodox

terminology the term refers chiefly to a knowledge affair; there is experience and there is an experiencer, a knower. Nature is one thing; man's inner conscious life is another. This, however, is just one of the dualisms which Dewey rejects; "since the seventeenth century," he says, "this conception of experience as the equivalent of subjective private consciousness set over against nature . . . has wrought havoc in philosophy." [10] Experience is for an observer, he admits; the point is not that experience is nobody's but that, while always somebody's, it is not merely somebody's.[11]

But the author's language is not clear. While insisting upon a "a realm of purely personal events . . . that are his exclusively," [12] there are passages in which these "purely personal events" seem to be completely disallowed when discussing the term's basic meaning. Experience is described as having its own definitive traits, as has the occurrence, for example, of a house, a car, a book; like other things it is owned, but the ownership is an additive relation; the existence of experience is in a sense independent of possession. So, on the one hand, Dewey seems to allow experience to mean those intimate and unshareable events which are the private possession of every person; on the other, experience is public, impersonal, independent of selves.

The latter seems to be the author's main point. He objects to the question, "whose experience?" because it is held to imply that ownership by some one is such that a private quality affects all experience, which quality to him is absurd. "It is obvious . . . that a house can be owned when it has existence and properties independent of being owned. . . . Substitute 'experience' for 'house,' and no other word need be changed." [13] This experience is, in last analysis, not some person's; it is nature's, local-

ized in a body as that body happens to exist by nature.[14] The personal-impersonal dualism is thus, he believes, resolved.

But is it? That experience is "mine," "yours," "Uncle Joe's," in a sense that no house can be, seems irrefutable; and its possession, so far from being additive, is its essential and primary condition. An experience is, as C. D. Broad says, "a mental event which is owned by some mind."[15] A house, to continue Dewey's analogy, may pass through an indefinite number of ownerships: it is handed down as an inheritance through many generations; conceivably it is put to many and varied uses—as a dwelling place for families, as an institution for industrial operations, as a business investment of a realtor, as a community center, as a preserved and treasured memorial. In all these conditions and transitions, the house surely "has existence and properties independent of being owned," and it acquires new properties in each change through which it is carried. But it is also true that there are properties of experience intimately related to the house, which are inexchangeably owned by the various groups which have had connections with it. The term experience must include mutual sharings of mind round which cluster deeply cherished sentiments; it must also include private meaning much of which is by its very nature unshareable. The inexchangeable, non-transferable aspects are not independent of being owned and it is these, after all, which make an experience an experience.

It is difficult to understand how, on Dewey's theory, human values can be meaningful. The extent of the impersonality that characterizes his view is clearly seen in the following: Dewey says, "in first instance and intent, it is not exact nor relevant to say 'I experience' or 'I think'; 'it' experiences or is experienced, 'it' thinks or is thought,

is a juster phrase."[16] The "I" is relegated to a subordinate role. Personal pronouns are ill-fitting clothes to mere organisms. It is clear, therefore, that the self as mind is ruled out; instead of experience belonging to individuals as a knowledge affair it is, as A. K. Rogers has pointed out, the other way round: selves belong to experience.[17]

The theory of mind on which this whole philosophy rests presents the chief difficulty. If we accept Dewey's point with reference to the "primacy and ultimacy of the material of ordinary experience,"[18] it is not easy to see how any intelligible meaning can be attached to the statement without a notion of the self as mind, there and consciously experiencing "at first instance and intent." Experience, with all its obvious sociality through communicable meanings based on language, is in last analysis always an affair of private mind.

2. A similar difficulty appears in Dewey's attempt to resolve another dualism, that between experience and nature. These are not, he says, names apart and alien; neither is the former a thin layer of the latter, nor an insignificant incident compared to it. Rather does experience penetrate into nature, "reaching down into its depths."[19] Indeed, Dewey at times seems to equate experience with all external existence. When he says, for example, that "what experience suggests about itself is a genuinely objective world which enters into the actions and sufferings of men and undergoes modifications through their responses,"[20] there is intimation that experience does not come to be through the process of entering into the actions and sufferings, which commonly would themselves be thought of as experiences, but is itself objective subject matter.

This interpretation of experience as all-inclusive is, however, not Dewey's final theory. It is rendered impos-

sible by the practical limitations of life; that is, experience does occur to organisms, and if experience *is* existence, then it must occur to part of itself. Dewey apparently recognizes this when he says that "experience as an existence is something that occurs only under highly specialized conditions." And its occurrence, not "everywhere and everywhen," requires "highly organized creatures" and a "specialized environment." Only organisms capable of connecting antecedent activity with consequent results can have an experience.[21] But here, once again, it must be noted that the emphasis is on organism, not on personality. "The seen involves a relation to organic activity, not to a knower, or mind."[22] It is clear that this equating of experience and nature is open to the same criticism as in the case of the personal-impersonal dualism.

3. Dewey considers the resolution of a third dualism. While experience, on this view, does not attach to a knower, or experiencer as mind, it does not follow, for our author, that there is in any sense an antithesis between experience and thought. Dewey relates the discussion to memory. It is commonly held that doings of the past are often had without control by insight, and that memory of even these unreflective acts may be used in present situations. But Dewey will not allow the term experience to apply to this sort of thing, which is accidental, non-rational, non-scientific. Experience requires reflection; it is never completely thoughtless. "There can really be no conscious experience without inference."[23] So far from being the realm of the mere "has been," reminiscence, precedent, "its connection with the future is its salient trait."[24]

In this unending on-going that is experience nothing changeless is discovered; the fact of inevitable and unceasing modification is basic. "Experience . . . has depth. It

also has breadth and to an indefinitely elastic extent. It stretches. That stretch constitutes inference."[25] Through this expansive stretch of experience, its connections and continuities, its prospective projection into the future, Dewey introduces the significant role of contexts, inclusive and pervasive, by which philosophic thinking escapes being a mere "beating of wings in the void."

Now, the description of the bigness of experience in this fashion seems acceptable enough and plausible at first glance. In the light of its implications for moral theory, however, the principle of context, as Dewey uses it, becomes questionable. For the inclusiveness of the context of experience is here interpreted to mean the exclusiveness of the psychological-social approach to moral judgment. In the light of the above criticism of this naturalistic position, this view of moral valuing is inadequate. It involves in the last analysis a social theory of conscience, which seems to offer no intelligible basis for obligation; conscience becomes little more than a slightly modified vox populi.

The discussion regarding the context of thought in ever-changing experience only makes greater the need for experiencing personal mind.

4. There is yet another aspect of Dewey's concept of experience which we can scarcely neglect. It involves a fourth dualism to be resolved, that between subject-matter and method. As referring to both subject-matter and method, experience "includes *what* men do and suffer, *what* they strive for, love, believe, and endure, and also *how* men act and are acted upon, the ways in which they do and suffer, desire and enjoy, see, believe, imagine."[26] While conceding the convenience and necessity of making a distinction between the *what* and the *how* of experience,

Dewey insists that such distinction is only in thought, not really in existence at all.[27]

Here again, it is apparent, Dewey departs from time-honored terminology. Throughout the discussion the driving motive seems to be the resolution of the dualism between knowing and its object. Method, and the agent that employs the method, as well as that to which the method is applied, are all naturalistically conceived, as mere parts of one nature, and hence in the last analysis not distinctively different from each other.

It should be remembered, however, that this philosophy is not extreme or "pure" naturalism. Dewey cannot allow mechanism. Watsonian behaviorism he holds to be untenable, and chiefly because it does not properly account for the social, which for him is "the inclusive philosophical idea."[28] The reduction of what is ordinarily called mental phenomena to the level of the stimulus-response formula is regarded as gross over-simplification, for it is language and communication that express the uniqueness of humanity, and its essential peculiarity is that it enables man to share a situation.[29]

This clear incompatibility with gross materialism makes it important that we understand the particular aspect of naturalism that is here stressed. And on this point Dewey will help us. He says: "The term 'naturalism' has many meanings. As it is here employed it means, on the one side, that there is no breach of continuity between operations of inquiry and biological operations and physical operations. 'Continuity,' on the other side, means that rational operations grow out of organic activities, without being identical with that from which they emerge."[30] Thus, mind is a natural emergent, a quality of behavior; the organism is "part and parcel of the course of events"; and

experience is a reciprocal interaction of natural objects, of which the physical body of man happens to be one.

But from the standpoint of the "spectator" this question arises: How can interaction between two parts of nature, as merely "natural," be substituted for what is commonly called mental activity? How can natural interaction render moral judgments? How else indeed, save by mind that is something more than a mere piece of nature's on-going? Dewey makes much of the necessity of abstraction, in fact, his whole analysis of thought is built upon it[31] and this includes the formulation of his moral theory.[32] Values, ideals, meaning, must be here conceived as somehow one with nature, yet significant to organisms through abstraction. But, as many will continue to insist, it is not clear that there can be any abstraction except as it involves the separation of subject-matter from other subject-matter, by methods other than the subject-matter, employed by a mind different from and transcending the subject-matter.

This functionalism, while emphasizing processes, scarcely recognizes a self characterized by self-knowledge and self-direction. It describes thinking in relation to situations and to the formulation and the execution of ideals; but it fails to take into account the inner, self-conscious life of a being who may not merely criticise his own desires and motivations but may come to desire a nature which he does not yet possess, who is capable of an immediate experience of his fellows, and who may be consciously alive to the fact that the world is intelligible, has meaning, and has value. An important point of emphasis for the Great Tradition will always be this: "Unless and until experience is recognized as essentially personal in character, neither the possibility nor the nature of that which has been called religion can be discerned."[33]

IV

Not only in presenting a concept of experience, but throughout the development of this naturalistic humanism, the basic issue seems to be the notion of mind. To the "traditional" view it has seemed reasonable to hold that if there are valuations, mind is that which evaluates; if there are meaningful experiences, mind is that to which these experiences have significant meaning. But Dewey's position amounts to such complete reversal of emphasis that he refers to it as a Copernican Revolution. He points out that his views involve "hardly less than a revolutionary transformation of many of our most cherished convictions."[34] The issue is expressed clearly in these words: "The old center was mind, knowing by means of an equipment of powers complete within itself, and merely exercised upon an antecedent external material equally complete in itself. The new center is indefinite interactions taking place within a course of nature which is not fixed and complete, but which is capable of direction to new and different results through the mediation of intentional operations."[35]

This functional approach to the problem of mind is expressed throughout the American pragmatic movement, but it is only in Dewey that we find complete formulation of the position. Charles Peirce who laid the foundation for instrumentalism was too much under the Platonic tradition to equate mind with doing; mind is not considered operational, it is an intrinsic aspect of the universe. Things for Peirce are "present to the mind."[36] And likewise for William James, perhaps the chief spirit in the development of American pragmatism. In his early work he was concerned to find a criterion for discovering the existence of mind, and concluded that "the pursuance of future ends and the choice of means for their attainment

are the mark of the presence of mentality in a phenomenon."[37] Later he moved toward the instrumentalist view, but he cannot be called a thorough-going functionalist. As Bush has pointed out, "James was too much interested in the uniqueness of personality; he was too much the artist . . . to take readily to the impersonal point of view of science."[38]

Functionalism becomes complete in Dewey for whom "the mind is in the world as a part of the latter's on-going process. It is marked off as mind by the fact that wherever it is found, changes take place in a directed way."[39] The mind is functional in a two-fold sense: on the one hand, the mind has the prime purpose of furthering organic action "from the doubtful and confused to the clear, resolved and settled"; on the other hand, it *is* the functioning of natural non-mental events in a directed way.

Here again is a confusion of language. When reference is made to "an active participant in the drama of an on-going world," there can be no quarrel. The active function of mind is a well-known principle with historical connections of wide extent. It is not a novel position, then, to hold that man is the measure of all things, that things are in a sense what they are experienced as, that thought is influenced by selective interests; we can not be indifferent to the present scene. To say that the mind is active is, however, quite different from saying that mind is merely a trait of activity. It is easy to understand that mind is *in* regulated change, but how can mind *be* these transitions? "It is marked off as mind," but what does the marking and for what is the designation made? "Wherever it is found . . .," but who makes the discovery? If mind is discoverable in purposing, what can explain the latter?

This implication of transcendence—that is, that things in whatever realistic or idealistic manner interpreted are

"present to the mind"—continues to haunt this theory. Dewey is unable to allow the process of "starting with a purely mental state as psychic and then conferring upon it a capacity to refer to something non-psychical."[40] But we have to ask: how else is a start possible? How else can any intelligible meaning be given to "conferring"?

Purpose is in line with this philosophy because of its inherent futurity and its emphasis on the distinctly human. Dewey denies mechanism. "Any notion that human action is identical with that of 'lower' animals is silly. It is contradicted by the fact that behavior is so organized in human beings as to have for its consequence all that we call civilization, culture, law, arts—fine and industrial, language, morals, institutions, science itself."[41] But it is difficult to conceive of behavior being so remarkably organized by mere organic "its." Man will lose his distinction in the animal world "when the dog develops a system of astronomy or the cow pauses on the hill top to admire the view." Meanwhile, wherever science places man in the order of things, the science is still man's science. It is conscious selves, not de-personalized organisms, who have experiences, who philosophize, who acquire knowledge, who decide whether morals are approvable.

In this "subjective bias" we have what A. N. Whitehead has called "the basis of all philosophy."[42] Giving the founder of modern thought credit for bringing the notion of the self into prominence, he says: "In this doctrine Descartes undoubtedly made the greatest philosophical discovery since the days of Plato and Aristotle."[43] In the words of Arthur Eddington, "mind is the first and most direct thing in our experience, and all else is remote inference."[44]

Primacy of mind is, of course, objectionable to functionalism. Dewey's theory is indentified with emergent

evolution. He distinguishes three plateaus of interaction fields: the physical, "the scene of narrower and more external interactions," which has the properties of the mathematical-mechanical system; the level of life, plants and animals of great variety; and the level of "association, communication, participation." The first defines matter; the second defines the psycho-physical; the third "is marked throughout its diversities . . . by common properties which define mind as intellect."[45] "Organic and psycho-physical activities with their qualities are conditions which have to come into existence before mind," which is "an added property assumed by a feeling creature, when it reaches the organized interaction with other living creatures which is language, communication."[46]

Now, this plainly begs the question. In assuming a driving purpose behind the entire upward urge toward the level of language, there is implied intelligence. The "operations" by which the creature reaches the higher plateau are certainly not blind actions. In Dewey's own words, "Apart from intelligence, these changes are not directed."[47] But it is assumed all the way through that they do not merely take place; they are carried out with "regulation"; there is some "direction" in the process. These are qualities of action by which it is held that "mind is marked off as mind," but it is an evident circle to take such qualities for granted during all the process of evolution and then speak of them as designations of what can only come as a late and new event in the order of things.

Further illustration of this circularity seems to appear in the manner in which these plateaus—nature, life, mind—are on this theory related to one another. A wonderful order and fitness, Dewey claims, characterizes the whole system of things; it is this that ties the parts together and only this that makes possible the emergence. Mind, he

says, can evolve only where there is "an organized process in which the fulfillments of the past are conserved and employed." And when it evolves, we are empirically acquainted with it only in connection with some organized body, "a body-mind whose structures have developed according to the structures of the world in which it exists."[48]

What clearer implication could be given that there is in and through reality a universal pattern or plan which, underlying and even directing changes, is itself non-temporal and does not evolve? Nature does indeed have her laws and processes, "according to" which life is ordered, but if we follow the lead of the subject-matter in the above quotation, there seems to be no great step from Dewey's "pattern" immanent in nature to Plato's Good as "the author of knowability and truth."[49]

Not only does it seem evident that the pattern of structure can not in its full meaning appear as a late event; it is also true that mind is not completely explained as "a further process in life."[50] As Lloyd Morgan, one of the greatest emergent evolutionists, says, "the issue turns on the status of mind in the progress of events."[51] But what is this status? Morgan saves his theory of emergence by admitting that there are three senses in which the word "mind" is used: first, as Mind or Spirit in reference to some activity, for us God; secondly, as a quality emergent at a high level of evolutionary advance; and thirdly, as a psychical attribute that pervades all natural events in universal correlation. Referring to the second, he says emphatically: "only in this sense is the word 'emergent' in place or applicable; for Mind as directive of emergent evolution does not emerge."[52]

But it is precisely this position to which Dewey objects. Although there is immanent pattern and struc-

ture, mind is additive; there is no Mind as directive. If we ask why the levels emerge, the answer seems to be: "this is one of the ways nature goes on."[53] But why should there be emergence? Purposive emergence "according to the structures of the world" implies, as Morgan allows, the concurrence of Mind—"for us God." And a criterion of this purposing Mind is transcendence; being directed "intentionally" upon nature, it is different from nature and cannot have come from it. Mind is not derivative, it is primary and ultimate.

V

To what end does this lead? To an interviewer inquiring about ideas and writings, Theodore Dreiser recently said, "At a time like this, when a man can't afford even to sit down in peace, when the whole world is at a crisis—no, that's not the time to discuss literature. That is a hell of a subject for you to be plugging at now. Why don't you try to catch up with the world? Do you think this system is so good it can't be better? Have you ever seen Russia? No! And you want to talk about books."[54] Similar reaction would probably be uttered by many to the present undertaking. But here is an issue of great significance, and it is not unrelated to the present situation in the history of nations.

Life's numerous diversities threaten to lose themselves in meaninglessness. But frustration is prevented—not mainly by our intellectual ability, however wisely applied, but rather by what seems to be the way things are put together. Man's life is in some degree given a characteristic pattern by reason of his being just what he is; his activities seem to be grounded in a basic "human nature" more or less unitary; basic wants and capacities, granted opportunity for expression, belong to a system. We live

in an intelligible world. There are regularities upon which we can depend, laws of nature which cannot be defied with impunity but they can be controlled through obedience.

These patterns, structures, tendencies, relations in nature—whence came they? Shall we say that they just are? But that is to beg the question. To escape the futile hypothesis that the myriad forms in the world and in life came to be by chance, we accept the alternative that they need no other credentials than that they are fundamentally the patterns, methods, purposes of eternal Mind, to whose activities some of our purposive efforts offer an imperfect analogy.

Insistence upon the primacy of Mind is not just to look backward. In this thought lies the hope of the future. No extravagant claims for religion are here involved, for the knowledge of God in man's development springs no doubt from deeper sources; but here and now this "Nature's witness to God" has an apologetic worth as showing, in an age of science, that the Christian faith, thrown overboard by most naturalists, is intellectually defensible. Today we in the western world face a choice between Christianity and naturalism. Certainly the two do not go together.

In the present world, in the face of a new tide of official cruelty, the landmarks of human freedom need to be guarded most stubbornly not alone by the troops of the great "democratic" powers but also, and not least, by those who wield the sword of the spirit. When the revolution came in Germany, the universities were silenced; they had boasted of their devotion to truth, but they were strangled. Likewise the press—no freedom-defenders there. But the church did not fold up. With courage and persistence, as

Albert Einstein, himself no churchman, recently said, "only the church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's path for suppressing truth."

There is here a great principle which is often repeated today. Reinhold Niebuhr, Thomas Mann, Ordway Tead, and many another are insisting that the fundamental ideals of democracy are one with the basic principle of Christianity. As President Roosevelt recently said, "The cause of religion, democracy and good will are one fight among the nations." These undergird the city with foundations.

FOOTNOTES

1. H. A. Overstreet, *The Enduring Quest.* New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1931. p. vii.
2. W. M. Urban, *The Intelligible World.* London: The Macmillan Co., 1929. p. 11.
3. Bertrand Russell, *Mysticism and Logic.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1932. p. 47.
4. Pascal, Blaise, *Thoughts,* in Harvard Classics. New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1910. Vol. 48, p. 120.
5. W. E. Hocking, *Types of Philosophy.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929. p. 87.
6. John Dewey, *The Quest for Certainty.* New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1929. p. 192.
7. *Ibid.,* pp. 9-10.
8. *Ibid.,* p. 23.
9. John Dewey, *Experience and Nature.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1925. p. 1a.
10. *Ibid.,* p. 11.
11. *Ibid.,* p. 6.
12. *Ibid.,* p. 172.
13. *Ibid.,* p. 232.
14. *Ibid.,* p. 231.
15. C. D. Broad, *Mind and Its Place in Nature.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925. p. 376.
16. John Dewey, *Experience and Nature.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1925. p. 232.
    Human Nature and Conduct. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1922. p. 314.
17. A. K. Rogers, *English and American Philosophy Since 1800.* New York: The Macmillan Co., p. 397.

18. John Dewey, *Experience and Nature.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1925. p. 18.
19. *Ibid.,* p. 3a.
20. John Dewey and Others, *Creative Intelligence.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1917. p. 7.
21. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916. pp. 163-164.
22. John Dewey and Others, *Essays in Experimental Logic.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916. p. 256n.
23. *Creative Intelligence,* p. 8.
24. *Ibid.,* p. 7.
25. *Experience and Nature,* p. 4a.
26. *Ibid.,* p. 8.
27. *Democracy and Education,* pp. 193-197. Also Chs. XIII and XIV.
28. John Dewey, *Philosophy and Civilization.* New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1931. pp. 77-92.
29. *Experience and Nature,* pp. 177-178.
30. John Dewey, *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1938. pp. 18-19.
31. John Dewey, *How We Think.* Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1910. Ch. VI: *Quest for Certainty,* p. 237.
32. Dewey and Tufts, *Ethics.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1932. pp. 190-196.
33. E. L. Schaub in *The Philosophy of John Dewey,* ed. by P. A. Schilpp. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1939. p. 401.
34. *Quest for Certainty,* p. 200.
35. *Ibid.,* p. 290.
36. Charles S. S. Peirce, *Collected Papers,* ed. by Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931. Vol. I, p. 141.
37. William James, *Principles of Psychology.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1890. Vol. I, p. 8.
38. *Journal of Philosophy,* Vol. XIV, p. 516.
39. *Quest for Certainty,* p. 291.
40. C. W. Morris, *Six Theories of Mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 314n.
41. *Philosophy and Civilization,* p. 307.
42. A. N. Whithead, *Process and Reality.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929. p. 219.
43. *Ibid.,* p. 241.

44. A. S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928. p. 281.
45. *Experience and Nature,* p. 272.
46. *Experience and Nature,* p. 258.
47. *Quest for Certainty,* p. 214.
48. *Experience and Nature,* pp. 276-277.
49. Plato, *The Republic,* vii, 508e (Jowett).
50. *Experience and Nature,* p. 281.
51. C. Lloyd Morgan, *Emergent Evolution.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1922. p. 37.
52. *Ibid.,* pp. 1-2.
53. *Experience and Nature,* p. 308.
54. New York *Times* Book Review. March 16, 1941. p. 2.

CHARLES W. PIPKIN was graduated from Henderson-Brown in 1918. He furthered his education at Vanderbilt (M.A., 1919), at Harvard (1919-1922), at Oxford, England (Rhodes Scholar, 1922-1925; D. Phil., 1925) and at the Sorbonne, Paris (Carnegie Fellow in International Law, 1929-1930). Hendrix conferred upon him the LL.D. degree in 1934. From 1920 to 1922 he taught history and English at Massachusetts Institute of Technology; in 1925 he was made professor of government at Louisiana State University. Since 1931 he has been Dean of the Graduate School at Louisiana State University.

He served as president of the Conference of Southern Deans of Graduate Schools in the year 1936-37 and he has been a member of the Public Relations Council of the National Student Federation of America. Also in the field of Education he has served with the Gulf District Rhodes Scholar Selection Committee, with the Southern Universities' Conference on the Improvement of Graduate Instruction, with the National Conference on Graduate Study and Research. In the field of the social sciences he has contributed his service to the President's Conference on Home Ownership, to the President's National Emergency Council on Southern Economic Conditions, and to the Southern Regional Committee of the Social Science Research Council. Internationally, he was a member of the American Commission to Geneva, 1929-30, and he is now on the Executive Board of the American Society of International Law.

Dr. Pipkin is author of a number of books, including *The Idea of Social Justice, Social Politics and Modern Democracies,* and *The Duty of the Educated Mind.* The following essay evaluates democracy from an international point of view.

THE NEW PERSUASION OF DEMOCRACY

CHARLES W. PIPKIN
Dean of the Graduate School
Louisiana State University

MAX LERNER says in his Introduction to Niccolo Machiavelli's *The Prince and the Discourses:* "We live today in the shadow of a Florentine, the man who above all others taught the world to think in terms of cold political power."

It is a long time since this world-moving thinker was born in 1469. This was before the discovery of a land that today is convoying itself out into the dark waters of war toward the revolutions of Europe and stands in arms against the East. From the later European state-system to the European war and power systems of 1941, men have watched the politics of power at work in a world of drift. This kind of power has not proved it is a friend of democratic government.

The love of power has characterized politics in all ages, and men have fought with more or less intensity from tribal days to the War of the Balkans for the things that the imposition of power on others brings to them. The symbols of power have lured power-loving men. Imperialisms shape themselves out of old forms and move the peoples of the world with a strange fanaticism of devotion. The techniques of power have changed as the masses of mankind have had to be controlled by the leaders, the Princes, of this world. Machiavelli defined this principle when he said that the forefathers and those who were esteemed wise used to say it was necessary to hold Pistoria by means of factions and Pisa with fortresses. Adolph Hitler, in his Sunday morning, May 4th, 1941, address before

the Reichstag in Berlin praised the defeated Greeks; and his dark, malignant passion against Winston Churchill made the issue one of the technique of personality embodied for a people in a Prince Adolph Hitler and a Prince Winston Churchill. Behind the love of power in statesman or demagogue is the necessity of using persuasion to obtain power, to maintain power, and to use power to the ends of keeping office.

Hitler, in his Reichstag appeal, knew that he was persuading a mighty war nation to carry forward a war policy which would endure, as he said, for a millennium. The rhetoric of his persuasion was heard wherever the radio reached—conquered peoples of his power, the Axis Allies and the beleaguered militant democracies against him. He was persuading millions of his followers to challenge the "democratic agitators," and identified each Nazi with the vision of a Reich having the "mightiest armament process the world has ever seen." Here persuasion was used to maintain a power and to sustain achievement in political organization.

Almost at the same time on the same day, in the quiet Virginia town of Staunton, President Roosevelt was dedicating the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Roosevelt said that the World War President had taught "that democracy could not survive in isolation. We applaud his judgment and his faith." This Manse, where President Wilson was born in 1856, became a national shrine, and yet the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt were the power-thrusting words of persuasion. There is little doubt that if those today who are most eager to join a League of Nations of War had given of their energies to the machinery of peace at Geneva twenty-one years ago, the world would have been saved the Battle of France, the Battle of England, the Battle of the Atlantic, the Battle of the Balkans, and all

the awful battles of a post-war world in the '40's of this war-devouring century. The Battle of America will be for a quality civilization.

A few years ago, Mr. Charles E. Merriam began his book, *Political Power,* at the time of the German Reichstag election of 1932. He was then "in the midst of a furious struggle for the possession of the symbols and the substance of political power in Berlin." Over forty years ago, Professor Merriam began in Berlin his monograph on the theory of sovereignty. Now, the Swastika flies over the Acropolis. After the years, the ever-occurring problems of political power remain, and in the working out of theories of the State, empires have fallen and dictatorships have powerfully defined the logic of their political authority. Democracies are alleged to be inadequate, impotent, and incompetent to work out the essential conditions of liberty and freedom in the twentieth century. Must we accept the belief that the persuasion of the ephemeral victories in politics are more powerful than the long engagement which Cromwell talks about of founding a constitutional basis for government? Milton nobly uttered the words which are the high persuasion of constitutional morality.

The democratic process is primarily concerned with the ideal of persuasion in human affairs. The hope is that political power in the process of social control will reach new responsibilities and with imagination raise the levels of decision which are made by the majority of the people. Each generation necessarily reconsiders the nature of power and the vast changes which have taken place in these times in technology and in the complex social environment of a machine-made world where man is not master. The unreason of things gives an unnecessarily realistic approach to politics. It may be that we have allowed political power and its sources of domination to

be little changed from the time of the Medici, but this does not mean that there has not been an effort by many minds to use a new strategy of persuasion in human affairs. This strategy is the strategy of reason: a reason which may lead to a new kind of authority of persuasion at a high level of dignity and moral worth. There is political change. This is amply illustrated in the vicissitudes of the Italian city states and now reaches to the blind Axis of Italy under Mussolini and Germany under Hitler. These nations were a part of the unification process creating the state systems of the nineteenth century.

Democracy is now experimenting with war on a world-wide stage.

Again the democratic state is attempting to use this revolutionary means to advance its interests and to protect its existence. To what extent this experiment is self-destructive is yet to be seen; but there are few who are confident that war as a national or international policy is a healthy way to obtain the conditions of liberty. The democratic state of the twentieth century has undergone upheaval in its internal structure, and episodic transformations have not advanced far the agencies of self-control and development in democratic society. Economic and social justice have not been achieved by the so-called democracies. Yet, in a century of catastrophic change, these democracies are attempting to use war as an agency of international security. It is the old and ever-new persuasion of force. It is democracy attempting to be Lion and Fox.

It is for this reason that thoughtful minds look out questioningly upon an exhaustingly excited world scene. The impersonality of war is no argument for democratic processes. The war has not stopped constant inquiry into

the causes of international anarchy. Internal civil strife abides. The literature of these times continues to define the hopes of a better organization of the democratic state. Generous schemes of a new world order have already been given to the peoples of the democracies. Often these drafts of a rule of law include the present enemy powers.

Winston Churchill, it may be reminded, was the first responsible statesman to offer a common citizenship for England and France, but this is not enough. There is a common citizenship to which all men belong. It is a citizenship that knows no cultural boundaries, leaps across frontiers of hate-breeding nationalism and sweeps before it the pigmy schemes of narrow economic planning.

This year there has been organized the Union for Democratic Action, the purpose of which is to organize progressive Americans to participate in an effort to revitalize democracy as the liberating revolutionary force it once was. The war will undermine and paralyze many of the once powerful persuasions of democracy. The aims of this Union for Democratic Action are:

1. That all possible help must be given to nations now meeting the thrust of Fascist dictators.
2. That democratic peace terms must be made part of the fight to win the war and destroy Fascism.
3. That national defense must be a defense of democracy.
4. That hemisphere defense calls for a realistic program of economic cooperation among the Americans.
5. That a program of economic reconstruction is an integral part of the defense of democracy.
6. That democratic safeguards must accompany any necessary increase in the scope of governmental power.

If the United States is to face the future with confidence in its internal strength and integrity, great socializing resources of democratic faith and practice must lead in creating the conditions of a new freedom for a liberated peace in this century.

In his recent book, *Night Over Europe,* Frederick L. Schuman uses the phrase, "the diplomacy of nemesis 1939-1940," to describe what is practically contemporary diplomacy. The collapse of European democracy and the conquest of the continent by Caesarism is the diplomacy about which he is now concerned. This brilliant writer in his preface gives encouragement to all who are looking into the present abyss and who are compelled by the impact of shattering events to consider World War No. II in our generation. Mr. Schuman offers this *apologia:* "Those who write of politics and war in the midst of the world's ordeal write dangerously, both for themselves and for their readers. To take a ringside seat at Armageddon, to sit by with one's books, to set down one's passing thoughts as if he had no part in the battle seems almost contemptible to those who know that all they cherish is at stake. But he who finds no better way to serve, he who believes that those also serve who only sit and write, has no option but to write and to hope, while writing, that the quest for truth is also service of a kind, even if only partially successful." The printing presses of the democracies have not failed to fill the markets with books and studies on the causes of allied defeat in France, the strategy of democracy in a totalitarian world, the war in the air and democratic organization in this era of international anarchy. The age of the pamphleteer has returned, and with it the skillful use of radioteering and visual excitement of the practices of man's destructive energy.

It is no wonder Dean Inge, who twenty-one years ago felt upon his soul the awful futility of War No. I, should now lash out like a Lear his lament. Dean Inge, years ago, was made somewhat less bitter by his belief that the men who died could not, thank God, know that they had died in vain. Now he has lived the Psalmist's span and into the fury of war burning by night and by day his ancient landmarks of England and of Court and of Creed. In his book, *The Fall of the Idols,* with no fresh Christian patience, he wishes that his call to rest had come before "the outbreak of this tedious and suicidal war." The former Dean of St. Paul's knows, with all sad and wise and military men, that his century is dedicated to war; and, though no one can see the strange pattern by which this century may be later changed, the plunge has been made. What may happen to civilization, no one is foolish enough to hazard a prophecy. It is to be expected of one whose mind was shaped by the thoughts of the struggles of the nineteenth century—progress, free trade, empire building, and democracy—should seek in the ruins of half-lit things older traditions inherent in Christianity, humanism, liberty, and science. And these traditions may well remain traditions if there is no health in democracy's recuperation after the present carnage leaves the world perhaps aimlessly exhausted.

The approach of the American writer to foreign affairs is somewhat more violent than that of the English one. It seems that the very distance which divides the United States from the immediate area of war intensifies the feelings of American writers who rarely see any other colors in war's mad spectrum but black and white; and, now and then, red. A crisis language is the language of our interpretation. There is a detachment, tense though it be, in much that is written by the mature of mind in Eng-

land. This difference was plainly seen in the writings about the first war of certain responsible political and literary men and women. Of course, there were the hot phrases of propaganda and the well done jargon arguments of duty to God and King and Country. But so far as I now read and have read, no such complete abandonment of rhetoric or truth characterized British propaganda as was of marked quality in propaganda of the United States before and after the United States entered the war. The debates of February, 1941, in the Senate of the United States illustrate this point. The debates in May, 1941, on the convoying of American ships are again in point.

II

One of the amazing beliefs of the average American is that the foreign policy of his country has really been one of isolation from the affairs of the nations of the world. The history of our country suggests that the opposite is true. From 1776 throughout the nineteenth century and down to Roosevelt's address at Woodrow Wilson's birthplace, we have intervened in a direct way with the internal policies of other nations. President Roosevelt reminded his audience at Staunton: "In this valley of Virginia it will remind America that his ideals of freedom were wide enough to support democracy in all the world." The United States has never been a neutral country. In the present world crisis, the blow at England and the invasion of the Low Countries settled that. It is now a thing to be desired above all else that a moral basis for international unity must be found. The concept of the larger interest of the world community has not been given the genuine support of national policy. It has no world support. What was done in the years at Geneva is not an adequate test of what might be achieved when peace as a policy chal-

lenges nations as war is today uniting hemispheres. The community of interest of modern states in war is today a decisive fact of world anarchy. There is no community of interest in peace.

It is no comfort in hearing today the arguments of those who would intervene in war all over the world, to recall that many of them refused to enter into the obligations of using the peace machinery at Geneva. They send bundles now when brains two decades ago would have clothed the bodies of humans and made peace in our time. The United States has been and is part of an unorganized world of war. It has not done its duty to organize the peace of mankind. And now, 1941, those who were isolationists in peace are belligerent interventionists in war. This should not be forgotten around the peace tables after this war. Professor Charles G. Fenwick says in his *American Neutrality, Trial and Failure:* "The United States has a vital national interest in the maintenance of international law and order. That interest is not incidental to any lesser interest; it is a primary interest in itself. It is not a transitory or occasional interest, to be considered when an emergency arises and then abandoned in times of comparative calm. It is a fundamental interest which of necessity results from the fact that we are living in a world with other nations and cannot cut ourselves off from social and economic relations with them, no matter what degree of formal political detachment we may endeavor to maintain. We have a right to protect that interest against lawbreakers; and we have a duty to protect it. For there can be no more than an armed peace ahead of us for many years to come unless we are willing to undertake with other nations the formulation of just rules of law and also willing, when they have been formulated, to cooperate in maintaining them."

At this time it is more difficult than in 1938 to agree with Professor Rippy when he wrote that "Europe's strife has become America's shield." His book was *America and the Strife of Europe*. We are now desperately in the knowledge that the United States, while it may be largely isolated from Europe in politics, has not been apart in its thought and feeling about politics. Professor Rippy discusses the ideology of Isolationism, the Democratic Experiment in Peril, Pacifism, Expansionist Idealism and Rationalizations, and Enthusiasms of 1898 and After. His discussion of the influence of Theodore Roosevelt and William Jennings Bryan is historical writing of the finest kind. He has helped to give a calmer interpretation of Wilson and the peace of Europe. The following statement is contemporary: "Who can be certain that individuals of this type ('prophets of "manifest destiny," of "inevitable destiny" ') were not responsible for our involvement in the World War? Examine the records of the men of influence in this country, even including the powerful bankers, and you will find that most of them were hostile to the German 'military autocracy' from the very outset. Impartiality between the belligerents was rare in the Wilson administration. Perhaps the only strictly neutral man in Wilson's cabinet was W. J. Bryan, who held the same democratic creed but was restrained by pacifism and by a lack of conviction that the principles to which he was devoted were actually threatened or could be served by taking sides in the war. And Bryan resigned in June, 1915. Next to Bryan in his determination to maintain an impartial attitude and follow a strictly neutral course was Wilson himself. But Wilson was weakened almost to paralysis by Page and House and Lansing, all pro-English. Political friends and political enemies played upon a mind, heart, and will already half convinced, until the President finally capitu-

lated and became a crusader. He became a crusader for political principles, principles which the nation was accustomed to cherish and willing to defend when they were thought to be in peril."

How tantalizing is Rippy's question, "Until world public opinion becomes more effective, what leader should it follow—an eighteenth-century Washington or a twentieth-century Wilson?" The political and academic climate from the beginning of our history makes it easy for a Johnson of California, a Borah of Idaho, a Kirby from Arkansas, and a Gore from Oklahoma to strut in a violence of personal prejudice their views of nationalism. From metaphysics of the first Inaugural of President Washington with his belief in the "Invisible Hand" and "providential agency" theory of the conduct of this nation to the present, no isolationist seems alien to an intimacy with the manifest destiny of this nation. I often wonder upon the thought that Woodrow Wilson was a pagan in contrast to their belief in what this nation shares with the "March of God on Earth." How intimately this doctrine is joined with commercial advantage and partisan politics we may never know. But, from Mr. Washington and Mr. Hamilton, the politics of commercial advantage have changed little. We are not far from what Mr. George Mason of Virginia in August, 1781, feared was "the mysterious circle of European politics." The circle has now been drawn.

There is strife in America. There is strife in Europe. Men of good will may hope in the language of Theodore Roosevelt that "our hemisphere has at last come of age." It is of infinite greater importance that finally a world of peoples and nations may seek an age of law and of decency. H. N. Brailsford, in his preface to *Farewell, France!* by Oscar Paul points to a future for the rights of man. "Once before," he says, "our ancestors faced the task that may

confront us tomorrow. They restored what could not live. Our ruling class will not attempt to revive the monarchy, but it may try to restore the corrupt society that broke at Sedan." The future may not be exactly what the writers of *The City of Man* declared in their thoughts on world democracy, nor do we need to accept Mr. Laski's *Where Do We Go From Here?* It is not enough that the world is divided against itself and that we take up arms against strange brethren across the seas. The final peace is a peace of brotherhood.

In recent years the close connection between economics, ethics, and politics has been a convincing power to men who believe in the essentials of democracy. Feudal loyalties were broken before the Reformation came which challenged political and religious and economic conformity. The Renaissance with its strange glory preceded the slow grouping of nation states. War at that time seemed to be a cohesive rather than a disintegrating force in nation building. Imperialisms stretched out eager hands to despoil the world. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the seeds were wildly sown to create a condition for a World War, which was to make the world safe for democracy. Now, in 1941, a universal war is upon us. A popular slogan of this war of the century is "a war to save a way of life," a kind of accepted democratic liberty and justice and nobility primarily for Anglo-Saxon peoples. One may well ask: For whom is this way of life to be made secure? What is this way of life and why do men have to fight each other for a way of life which means death and starvation for millions and the cruel, bitter paralysis of democratic action for those who believe they are prepared to understand and to sacrifice for this way of life?

Old persuasions of old economies evolved through the centuries have no passion of freedom in them today. A

new power of persuasion about social justice and human welfare is the source of strength and cohesion for the contemporary world order as a way of life for all peoples. A way of life is not a purpose of democratic power when each generation, Saturn-like, devours itself. A democratic way of life is not hemispheric. It covers the earth as the waters that cover the sea.

The democratic way of life means one thing: the spread of power to the people, or, as Mr. Wells says, the broadening of power at the base so that everyone will have privileges and rights as well as duties. A spread of possession must in the democratic system of the future be as equal as the existing dispossession of mind and things is today among the mass of the people.

This democratic way of life not only does not mean the perpetuation of privilege in the present world order. A tolerable way of life is demanded for the majority of the homes of white and yellow and black and brown men and women and children. This democratic view of power is the cornerstone of a future order of a companionable community of nations. No rejection of an ideal has ever failed to put fear in human hearts. Wherever an ideal fails, fear follows. Ideals beset the mind of man as equally as they allow no heart to be dulled by their audacity. Danton said audacity is the stuff of statesmanship. Audacity for human values is the democratic way of life for the new persuasion of democracy. War is defeatism in democracy. Peace in democracy is without meaning when the democratic way of life fails to include the last one of us.

WHILE GEORGE B. WORKMAN was a student at Henderson-Brown he made his decision to become a missionary. It was there also that he developed his active interest in Y.M.C.A. work. Between the time that he was graduated from Henderson-Brown and the time that he sailed, in 1933, to his mission in China, he did national and state Y.M.C.A. work. He served successively as Assistant State Secretary of the Arkansas Y.M.C.A., as a member of the National Student Staff of the Y.M.C.A., and as a director of religious education at the West Side Y.M.C.A. in New York City—then the largest single association in the world.

During the years he spent in Y.M.C.A. work, he furthered his education at the Yale Graduate and Divinity Schools from which he received the M.A. in 1928. In 1933 he and his family sailed for China as missionaries under the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. From 1933 to 1938 he lived in Soochow and Changchow in Kiangchow Province, China. While he was in residence at the latter post, the present Japanese invasion of China began. He and his family stayed through the major part of the fighting. Then on furlough, 1938-1939, he returned to the United States to study at the Union Theological Seminary whence he received the S.T.M. degree. In 1939 he accepted a post on the faculty of Soochow University at Shanghai, but illness in his family forced him to return to the United States. He is at present Program Secretary of the Y.M.C.A. at St. Petersburg, Florida.

The following essay by Dr. Workman has grown out of his experience in China and his study of the Chinese both there and in the United States.

THE CHINESE - THEIR SPIRITUAL EARTHINESS

GEORGE B. WORKMAN

Y.M.C.A. Program Secretary, St. Petersburg, Florida
(On leave from the China Conference of the Methodist Church, Shanghai Area)

All true words spread, as from the marsh's eye
The crane's sonorous note ascends the sky.
Goodness throughout the widest sphere abides,
As fish round isle and through ocean glides.
And lesser good near greater you shall see,
As grows the paper shrub 'neath sandal tree.
And good emerges from what man condemns—
Those stones that mar the hill will polish gems.[1]

I

IN A YEAR when national and racial animosities, strife and misunderstandings pervade the world it does not seem inappropriate to consider as a contribution in the field of religion an effort to understand one of the great characteristic spirits of another people.

To some it may appear presumptuous to undertake a description of any particular aspect of the mind or spirit of the Chinese, or of any other culture for that matter. Therefore it should be made clear that the conception implied is not that the Chinese are biologically different and therefore compelled to think, live, and worship differently. We must recognize, however, that there are certain psychological factors having to do with a cultural group's reactions to its environment, both material and spiritual, which need to be observed in thinking of and in having relations with that group. These psychological factors spring in part from the physical needs—which have a spiritual significance—of the group. Powerful economic conditions arising from highly intensified physical needs

and similar elements express themselves at least partially in particular mental attitudes and spiritual trends. It is therefore difficult to separate physical fact and spiritual reaction. In these two elements we can find some understanding of the past and present, and we can see the hope for the future in the task of social and spiritual reconstruction of a people. Thus it is with China.

Although there has never been any substantial amount of scientific testing of Chinese emotional and psychological reactions, it is recognized, probably by most psychologists, that the expression of their emotions is patterned, to a degree at least, by certain social factors. This is true of our own culture and when we turn to that of other peoples we observe considerable evidence of the same phenomenon. Such basic emotions and spiritual attitudes as fear, hatred, and anger have their peculiar expressions in different societies. When we read, "his jaw dropped," "his eyes popped out," "he clenched his fists," or some such statement, the feelings portrayed are clear. However, one cannot be too confident in interpreting such visible expressions in an alien social environment. While the statement, "Her eyes grew round and opened wide," would probably indicate surprise or fear to us, to the Chinese it means anger in most cases. In other words, these observable actions may be described as a part of the language. In order to understand them we must learn their meaning in the culture where they are observed. Such patterns of expression appear not only in the literature and theatricals of a people but in real life as well. Therefore it is well for those seeking to understand and have relations with other cultures to strive both to know the meaning of the external social expressions involved in these cultural heritages and to know what is back of such expressions in the way of emotions, mental conceptions, and spiritual attitudes.

Those interested in relating themselves more closely to other peoples would profit, then, by giving attention to what have been called the culture complexes, thought forms and patterns, ethnic individuality, and distinctional and temperamental characteristics of the various national and racial groups with which such a relationship is desired. Nomos, the idea that every nation is bound together by its own law of life, its own moral ideas, should receive consideration from those who expect to come into increasingly wider interracial concepts and understanding. Groups have tried to preserve intact their special cultural characteristics, and, like our wars today, the bloody events of China's past, such as the T'ai P'ing Rebellion and the Boxer Uprising, in part at least, have been efforts to absorb Christianity within the Chinese nomos or cultural entity.

The cultural mind, then, works in devious ways. If we can discover the ethos of a person's culture, what it requires and does not require along culturally patterned lines, we shall know better how to relate ourselves to that person with more effectiveness. Clarity in understanding other peoples and skill in effective spiritual and other intercultural relationships requires this observation and comprehension of the characteristic spirit or disposition of other cultures and communities, as expressed in their modes of living, manners, customs, peculiarities, and concepts.

We have had brought to our attention during recent years the social conception of personality. Often it has been observed that to separate a man from his native environment is to ruin or change his personality. In spite of the powerful force which cultural environment exerts over men, it is interesting to note how unconscious they seem to be of this influential cultural matrix which to so

great an extent conditions their personalities. One observer of the Chinese has recorded the same condition among that people. They fail to grasp, he says, the idea "that their own religious consciousness is in any way peculiarly their own; they have a delightful confidence that anyone who seeks the unseen things feels the same way (as they do)."

This ethnocentrism expresses itself in group or cultural egotism and brings to a people an unreasoned sense of the superiority of their own civilization. All outsiders come to be conceived of as barbarians. Chinese universalism, the belief that all under heaven are one great family, was in one respect sublime; in another respect, however, it was a narrow culture-centered conception, bigoted in many of its viewpoints, founded upon the assumption that the central core of this great world family was the Chinese race itself.

China shows many indications of belief in the value and superiority of her culture. She is known even today as Chung Wha, the "Middle Flowery" Republic. The famous Roman Catholic missionary Ricci gave cognizance to this ethnocentric concept in the Chinese mind when in making his map of the world he placed China at the center. Not only the Chinese but every people doubtlessly think of themselves as the center of the world; for that is the focal point around which, for them, all activities, feelings, and thoughts revolve. The witty African, Aggrey, was once introduced to an American audience as a "black man with a white heart" in recognition of this same cultural or color egotism among white people.

It has been remarked that the human race is just at the beginning of racial self-consciousness. China, to be sure, has its share of cultural self-consciousness, and we

must admit that the Divine Intelligence has been at work there in preparation for new periods of racial development. One of the forces behind the mental activity of the Chinese and their upward progress is the racial intelligence which has been the conscious and unconscious cooperation of that people with God in the working out of the progress of their culture. God, on the other hand, has, through the divine, creative, cosmic intelligence, steadily been working out and developing the human means of His own self-revelation among that people. Thus has been built this "Old Testament" in Chinese life and thought, the foundation upon which must be constructed the new Chinese civilization. As Judaism provided the basic civilization upon which Christianity arose, so, in some ways, the older faiths, customs, and philosophies of China, especially as they relate to the thought forms common among the populace, provide the soil which in part will nurture the future growth of her social and spiritual being. It is for this reason that those striving to understand and help China should give attention to what has been involved in the cultural consciousness of the Chinese and to the spiritual and social ideas which were its stock.

Christians in China doubtlessly will find it easier to put new content into old customs than to start new ones. Customs and traditions by their very existence have shown their indigenous nature, their ability to survive without constant fertilization and nurturing from external sources. They have become acclimatized and domesticated. Therefore if Christianity wishes to become native to China, to gain emotional as well as intellectual acceptance, to become independent and self-nourishing, it must express itself in Chinese fashion, putting forward the central spirit of its message and allowing it to be clothed in indigenous representations. Hymns, prayers, scriptural revisions, and

the like must be produced in the manner of the country. National ideology and personnel must form the base of a Christianity which is to be at best anything but a foreign importation.

It is for these reasons that we believe it valuable to try to discover what comprises the Chinese mind and spirit, some of the indigenous thought forms, social habits, emotional responses, ethical modes, religious viewpoints, and other phases of life which make the Chinese what they are today.

Generalizations along this line are dangerous. Many of the books written in this vein have indulged in observations which upon better acquaintance with Chinese character have proved not too accurate. Also China is in a great state of flux and transition which makes such description difficult. Nevertheless, and perhaps because of these considerations, it seems valuable—utilizing estimates by those well acquainted with Chinese life and recognized as capable students of the field, in addition to the findings of leading Chinese themselves—to try to set down anew certain of these facts, limited because of the length of this chapter to only one of the major characteristics of China's mental and spiritual outlook. Five years of residence in one of China's inland cities and a much longer interest in and study of China's culture have proved valuable in estimating the reliability of observations made by others, and especially in discriminating between those materials now out of date because of new forces and those materials still valid. Let us now pass to the consideration of one of these most obvious qualities of China's spiritual and mental viewpoint.

II

An outstanding characteristic of China is the earth-bound quality of its people and life. In her cities one may

find artificialities of modern times—the radio, newer methods in education, hospitals, the latest drugs, squalor, filth, and the last word in plumbing—but only when one leaves this increasingly sophisticated scene and winds his way into the rural areas does he discover the real China. Follow the trails through rice fields, beyond sight of highway and railroad, to some cluster of huts with their common threshing floor, smooth as a table top. A thicket of bamboo usually stands close by; and the children no doubt are playing in a clearing between the dwellings. A few dogs lazily patrol the edge of the settlement while men plow adjacent rice fields knee deep in mud. Women help with the crops or swish away with bamboo brushes at the cleaning of wooden night soil containers which they have just emptied into huge, glazed, earthenware jars. Or perhaps the peasant wives, sitting in the sun, bend over embroidery which appears too beautiful for any simple farm woman to produce. Only when one comes upon some such scene as this does he realize how truly China is a land of the soil.

In taking our trip to the "shang ho," or country side, not only are we going where the vast majority of China lives, moves, and supports itself, but we are entering a realm which dominates the thinking, morals, religion, and social forms of the nation. This earthy influence predominates not only in the lives of the vast horde of peasantry but throughout all classes, from the scholar and farmer at the top of the social scale to the soldier at the bottom. These along with the merchant, priest, and others all in their thinking and living retain that close relation to the "good earth" which has been characteristic of China for thousands of years.

Just as the common mind in China goes far back in its dependency upon agriculture and efforts to further it, so have the great teachers and philosophers of that land

bound their systems close to the soil. One of the thoughts which fills the mind of the average Chinese much of the time is that of food. It is the interest dominating a great deal of the social life of the country, which centers to a large extent in feasting. In like manner the philosophy of the Middle Kingdom clings close to nature, the giver of such sustenance and delight. We are not surprised therefore when a Chinese leader points out that his countrymen's conception of the universe is fundamentally naturalistic and that the very basis of Confucian ethics, which holds the dominating place in Chinese thought, is likewise naturalistic.

In keeping with the refusal of their great sage to soar to any great spiritual heights the Chinese, rather more than most people, have been this-wordly in their ideals. In modern times there are intellectual leaders like Dr. Hu Shih who represent the materialistic tendency of the Chinese as contrasted, for example, with the mystical bent of India typified in Gandhi. The latter opposes Western industrialism while the former advocates the rapid development of scientific knowledge and the utilization of man's physical environment as has been accomplished to such a large extent in the industrialized and mechanized Occident. While India has been ascetic, China has shown a predominantly materialistic frame of mind. As far back as the ancient Chou Dynasty efforts were made to promote man's material and bodily welfare as an essential condition of all gains in morals and the arts.

Lin Yutang, brilliant interpreter of his own race, attests that this attached-to-earth quality of the Chinese has a basis in Confucianism. He points out Confucius[2] as a realist in contrast to Jesus whom he calls a romanticist. The latter was a mystic, he believes, while the former was a positivist. The founder of Christianity was a humani-

tarian but the great Chinese sage was a humanist, Lin declares. There are some great souls who fail to have their interest aroused by the life hereafter, the question of immortality, or the world of spirits in general. This earth-bound type of philosophy would fail to satisfy the Germanic peoples, Lin asserts, but it has satisfied, he thinks, the Chinese—in general. Even they have not been quite satisfied he admits. Taoism and Buddhism have been called in to fill the deficiency. In these religions, however, the supernaturalism which appears seems to be separated from the true ideal of life in China. It provides a kind of emotional by-play and outlet that help make life endurable. *This* life, Lin observes further, seems to be too full for one to allow his time and thoughts to be absorbed in questions centering about immortality. It is the details of everyday life here and now upon which the writers of China dwell ceaselessly and with great emotion. China's writers, painters, and poets all have taken pure and unbridled joy in this everyday life. The Chinese, to be sure, are in love with *this* life and will not accept an invisible heaven as a substitute.

Such feeling for the earthly life provided by nature, a feeling which Lin Yutang thus aptly describes, wells up and overflows in Chinese poetry and long has been a great and significant part of this people's spiritual heritage. The rural ideal particularly, as revealed in Chinese art and literature, has been an important aspect of Chinese civilization. Two scenes which appear most prominently in the nation's art are those of rural relaxation and the family life of leisure. The former is replete with herb gatherers, recluses, and woodcutters. The Chinese had as their ideal the pure enjoyment of this simple rustic life. They did not strive, in line with the Greek conception, merely to exercise their powers along lines of their greatest endow-

ments, but rather they strove simply to delight in the pleasures which nature makes available to all her children.

The passionate love for nature revealed by Chinese painters in their portrayal of scenes from familiar daily life has made landscapes the highest achievement of these artists, and in depicting them there has been utilized a sincere and lively poetic feeling, interpreting every aspect.

The part which Taoism has played in attachment of the Chinese mind to nature has been an important one. While Confucianism, in its largely practical emphasis, refused to leave this world and therefore made for earthiness of a type, it was a this-worldliness that through stress upon social propriety became cramped and devoid of interest. Taoism and Buddhism provided relief from this too matter-of-fact attitude toward life. It was only a step from Taoist scepticism regarding Confucian rules of propriety and ceremony to romantic escape from such a social world and the return to nature. The most characteristic charm of Chinese culture in this way has come to be found in the rural ideal of life, with its recluse spirit of retirement to the hills, of the worship of country life so dominant in Taoism, and of the banishment of all worldly cares and worry.

Taoism long has been associated with this ideal. One of its main tenets as evidenced in practice has been emphasis upon a life, art, and literature firmly attached to nature. The worship of primitive and natural simplicity has been a most central theme. While Taoism, then, has been primarily rural, the Confucian outlook has been essentially urban, having to do largely with the many and varied social relations. Confucian propriety involved social status, human culture, restraint and control. Taoism disbelieved in restraint and culture; it emphasized the freedom and

relaxation which comes with return to nature. Lin Yutang describes the man who drinks Grade A pasteurized milk as a Confucianist and the person who prefers the natural country product as predominantly a Taoist in outlook. In the Tao, or way, is found a means of revolt against the artificiality and responsibilities of Confucian culture. The Tao becomes a means of return to nature and its path. The philosopher Chuangtse[3] in like manner directed brilliant satires against Confucianism and the hypocrisy and futility which he considered to be its accompaniments.

The background of naturalism in Taoist thought and practice has been cited as evidence that the Chinese have not been by nature strongly religious. Similar naturalistic tendencies have been found outside Taoism in the philosophies of the Sung[4] and Ming[5] Dynasties.

While Confucianism, as has been observed, had a certain kind of naturalism its trend was in the main humanistic. This socialized materialism was, as we have seen, not wholly satisfying to the Chinese. It worked excellently among the common people including the middle-class officialdom and its admirers, but for others it did not suffice. Man had a deeper nature which Confucian philosophy and modes of action did not quite touch. Strict Confucianism was "too decorous, too reasonable, too correct." Family and social life in China, which were primarily Confucian, became somewhat stilted and needed the relief brought by the rural scene so typically Taoist in its associations.

Two phases or types of naturalism, then, have been exhibited in the Chinese by their earth-bound nature. One of them, Confucian, has been essentially a scepticism of other-worldliness, an absorption of interest in the things of this world, including social relations. The other type,

Taoist, has denoted belief in the way of nature, a retreat from social relations to attain harmony with the universe. These two mind sets are alike in one respect—they have a certain desire to stay near this world which is obvious and close at hand. In another aspect they differ as to their naturalistic philosophy and its practical expression, as has been described. For this reason the picture of Chinese earthiness is not consistent in design and often becomes confused. Component elements, while alike in being opposed to far journeys in other-worldliness, do not harmonize well in other respects.

We do find the rural emphasis in one aspect of Confucianism; the Confucian ideal of the family was based upon the idea of ownership of land. To the present day this same concept is strongly retained; so that with the land inherited as a family birthright, purchase is extremely difficult. Often it is necessary to wait years until the owning family strikes financial disaster before that family can be persuaded to sell, even though the use intended for the property is socially constructive.

There is another point than that already mentioned where Taoism separates from some of the other popular philosophical ideas current in China throughout the centuries. This is the lack in Taoist tenets of emphasis upon provision for man's bodily needs. The Legalists and Confucius are said to have recognized the importance of such physical necessities and to have stressed economics and its organization as a means of securing them. Taoism, with true spirit of the recluse, belittled provision for the body; it sought to make man independent of the trammels of the flesh. In this particular it has borne certain resemblances to Buddhism.

Even in Confucianism excess in the matter of bodily provision was discouraged; the rule of the middle path has

been urged. In effect then these philosophies worked in the same general direction of a simplicity of life which has been one of the most obvious characteristics of the Chinese people. This tendency has been a most logical effect of the naturalistic and rural basis of Chinese thought. While interests of the great mass of people have been centered upon physical needs, these wants have been considered largely as confined to those most basic for existence of the race: the securing of food, clothing and shelter and provision for procreation. About these primary interests the talk, plans, and work of the people revolve closely. Such simplicity or paucity of interests is distinctive of the type of self-consciousness which has produced the Chinese nation. Economic need no doubt has been responsible to a large degree for such narrow delineation of interest; nevertheless it is interesting to note the close relation of this characteristic to China's naturalistic philosophy. To economic need, then, probably may be attributed in part the retention of simplicity of interest in worldly things and the prevention of more serious imaginative excursions into the field of other-worldliness.

With the trend toward a simple naturalism so great it is no wonder that, even with Chinese devotion to provision for bodily needs strong, it has remained for the West to bring in most modern comforts. Too much need not be assumed from this, as it was not until the industrial revolution that the Occident forged ahead of China in these matters. A survey of sanitary conditions, sewerage, and similar developments in the England and Europe of a century ago will reveal, doubtlessly, comparisons not disparaging to China; and it must be remembered that Peking very likely had sewers long before most of the European capitals.

Notwithstanding these considerations, the predominantly rural character of China has made for simplicity

to the extent of conservatism. It has been said that old social institutions persist longest in rural sections, and perhaps the same can be remarked about technical lag. In China's interior even today one usually has his tools made to order. While implements of modern design may be bought, few Chinese carpenters, masons, and other workmen use them as yet. The absence of modern sanitation is another technical lag brought forcefully to the attention in China's inland cities where night soil is removed in open buckets carried, by suspending the containers on the two ends of a bamboo pole balanced on the shoulder, down the narrow streets. There in the crowded thoroughfare contact of traffic with these buckets is likely unless care is exercised. In this night soil and its function of fertilizing the fields is symbolized Chinese unity with nature.

The Buddhists until recently have been responsible partially for lag in social advance in another area, that of getting rid of the mangy pariah dogs which roam the streets of many cities. These "wonks" nuzzle into garbage boxes found at various corners and seek to find nourishment among the refuse dumps. Attributable to these mongrels are many cases of rabies which are received in the hospitals of China during the summer months and which constitute a very real danger. The New Life Movement along with civic clubs has registered much progress in altering such conditions, but the unpleasant and unhealthy scenes allied with the problem are still far too common, particularly to the new-comer. No doubt Buddhist belief in the kinship of all life and its sacredness in all forms has had much to do with such conditions. Often a Chinese even will brush off a mosquito rather than kill it. Whether this practice too is connected with Buddhist influence we cannot be sure.

From these observations it becomes obvious that the Chinese has learned to accommodate himself remarkably to his environment. To inconveniences he has learned to submit himself with exemplary patience, knowing frequently the inevitableness of their nature. One observer of the Chinese over a long period of years has commented that this race while apparently in a situation of semi-strangulation has seemed in its own estimate fairly comfortable. In other words, Chinese standards of comfort and convenience have differed widely, especially during recent years, from those of our own.

In his philosophic attitude then, and because of it perhaps, the Chinese has subordinated himself to nature, has considered himself as part and parcel of his world, not in a dominating relationship but in one of harmonization. Astute students of Chinese culture have noted this pronounced ability of China's inhabitants to fit into their physical environment and adapt to it. Such ability has been singled out as one of the distinctive characteristics of their civilization. In China man and nature have had a unique sense of harmony. In the very word Tao, or way of nature, this ideal has been expressed. The way of the universe, of heaven and earth, have been considered as the way of man. In the spontaneous, natural development within himself of the same law at work in nature and the universe does man find his highest self, such has been the teaching of Chinese philosophy. In the West men have sought to control and harness nature so that she might meet human desires. The Chinese have sought to conciliate nature, to harmonize with it and to let the spirit of one's environment be expressed in his own life. Nature, to China's people, has not appeared debasing, inferior, and as something different and set over against the realm of human affairs. Man has had a close sense of intimacy with

nature in China and this relation underlies all Chinese thought. In poetry and painting we have already noted its broad influence. Man in Chinese landscape paintings becomes only one of the incidents of the natural environment. There is no clash between the two, but complete harmonization. The same life flows through nature and man, the physical and the human. The true way for man is in spontaneous response to this way of nature. From the first years of Chinese philosophy this sympathetic identification of man and nature has been expressed. The philosopher upon whose teachings Taoism was founded and who stands as the first of Chinese philosophical men, Lao Tzu,[6] said,

> Production without possession,
> Activity without self-assertion,
> Development without domination,
> This is the mysterious way of nature.

There may be much for modern man in this saying.

A long time resident of China who made the observations in the above paragraph concludes that in the Chinese light what seem to Westerners the self-evident essentials of life-activity—aggression, efficiency, control of nature—must be questioned. The discovery of a refined and successful civilization like the Chinese, in which harmony with the physical environment, the spirit of quiet and nonviolence, and man's unity with and subordination to nature are expressed, must bring about this questioning of our own standards.

One result of the simplicity and adaptability of China's people has been a deep self-reliance and self-respect. Especially is it believed that the large proportion of peasant land proprietors has encouraged these qualities.

A distinguished Chinese educator comments upon another quality closely associated with the naturalistic and

earthy bent of his people: that is the objective rather than contemplative tendency. Distinction is made at this point between the naturalism of Confucius and that of Lao Tzu. Confucius and Mencius[7] are pointed out as the ones who, because of their objective emphasis, in pre-Chin[8] days won allegiance of the people at large, superseding the more contemplative philosophies of Taoism and Chuangtze. Later Chu Hsi,[9] who believed that truth could be ascertained through observation of "all things under Heaven" assumed influence and continued to exert leadership for the cause of objectivity. It has been claimed that the dominant attitude thus displayed is similar to the Western idea of scientific observation.

There seems little doubt that despite all its handicaps this objectiveness, along with mental activities which have been observed to center largely around vital physical interests and which have been largely responsible for China's development to the present point, has been a great stabilizing and practical force among so vast a people and throughout so long a history as that of China. If such earthy philosophy has tended to separate the Chinese from many of the less tangible influences, their sensitiveness to this world all the more has been increased. They therefore have been primarily a sensory-motored people; they have lived close to nature; their motor centers consequently are more highly developed perhaps than those of the modern educated Westener. Some believe that these factors constitute a foundation for the reception and application of new tools and machinery, a groundwork that might not be suspected except by observation of the psychology and physiology of the people.

Allowing, then, for the variations to be expected in all general description of this kind, we find that the Chinese are primarily a people of *this* world. The farmer,

practical, with his thoughts never straying high above the soil he tills, nor below it farther than he plows, is rightly placed close to the upper end of Chinese social stratification. Because his earthy thought dominates the mind-set of the people he well might displace the scholar, perhaps, on the very topmost rung of the ladder. The qualities of naturalism, rusticity, objectivity versus contemplativeness, sensuality in the sense of being extremely susceptible to the pleasures and concerns of the body, love of nature, simplicity, conservatism, self-reliance, self-respect, adaptability to nature, and capacity for enjoyment of the life that runs close to the good earth—these are the characteristics that typify the Chinese. The man of the farm, provincial, good-natured, hard-working, virile, conservative, but profoundly real, remains today the soul of China, for whose inhabitants the only happy home is earthy nature from which they sprang, to which they are so closely bound, and to which eventually they must return.

FOOTNOTES

1. *The Shin Ching (The Book of Poetry),* Part II, Book III, Ode X, stanza 2. (Translation by James Legge.) *The Shin Ching* is a collection of odes and ballads current among the Chinese of the Chou Dynasty, 1122-256 B. C. It is one of the Five Canons of the Chinese Classics.
2. 551-479 B. C.
3. Born about 330 B. C. He was a great expositor of Taoism.
4. 960-1280 A. D.
5. 1368-1644 A. D.
6. His date is sometimes given as about the 6th century B. C.
7. Born about 372 B. C. He believed in the native goodness of human nature and had great confidence in the ordinary man.
8. The Chin Dynasty, 255-206 B. C.
9. 1130-1200 A. D. The greatest scholar of his age.

THE ESSAY BY HUGH D. HART printed here represents the viewpoint of a leader and organizer in the business world. Dr. Hart began his business career in Arkansas. He was graduated from Henderson-Brown in 1909; and three years later he received a second degree, Bachelor of Laws, from the University of Arkansas. He first entered business in Little Rock as a partner in an agency for the Aetna Life Insurance Company. In 1924 he was made head of the Aetna agency in New York City, and he built that agency into the largest in the United States. During the time he spent in New York, he was made one of the trustees of the National Association of Life Underwriters, and he served as chairman of the Association's reorganization committee. In 1927 he became Vice President of Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company. He spent the following five years reorganizing that company's agency system.

For eight years during the depression period when business was finding it necessary to make new adjustments, Dr. Hart became the consulting expert for the reorganization of many different corporations from New York to California. In 1940 he accepted the position which he now holds as Vice President and Director of Agencies of the Illinois Bankers Life Assurance Company.

Dr. Hart is author of two books: *Life Insurance as a Life Work* and *The Mature Person.* When the latter was presented as a commencement address at the University of Vermont in 1930, he had the honor of being the first Southerner to be awarded an honorary degree from that university. His essay, "In and Out of Dixie," is based upon thirty years of experience among Southern and Northern business organizations.

IN AND OUT OF DIXIE:

A Business Man's Viewpoint

HUGH DOAK HART

Vice President and Director of Agencies
Illinois Bankers Life Assurance Company

HE IS A BOLD MAN who undertakes to tell even an individual his faults. Then what a venturesome spirit one must have if one is to point out the shortcomings of a whole section of people—indeed of two sections which roughly embrace most of our entire country. The foreign guests whom we have entertained throughout the years with such adulation—beginning with the triumphal procession of Charles Dickens—have not hesitated to repay our hospitality by making the most blunt literary assaults upon our frailties and foibles, after those guests have returned to their native shores. It may not be amiss—perhaps I should say it may not be particularly daring for a native to do with humility, what our brethren from other lands perform with arrogance. Especially may this be permissible when the object is constructive; when the critic has lived long in both North and South, and has both memories and ties of a most sacred character in both sections.

Furthermore, when one attempts to balance with a fair appraisal the virtues as well as the faults, something of the sting of the criticism may be atoned for. The thing we are striving to attain here in the United States is a more perfect democracy. We must do that in order to compete with or disestablish the dictatorship ideologies abroad in the world today. We have heard much about the evils of those blatant tyrannies, and of the dire need for military competition with them, by which we may subdue them, or at least keep from being subdued by

them. We have heard all too little about our own shortcomings, and even less about the necessity for engaging in competition with those countries in perfecting a better citizenry than theirs. The solution of the whole problem of maintaining our democracy in a universe that is muddled by processes that we regard as little short of barbarous will rest, ultimately, not on the strength of our armies—important as that matter is at the present—nor on our wealth, nor on our scientific progress, nor on our constitution and laws. Democracy will be made or destroyed depending on the sort of people we may develop into. Of course, this is true of all other countries and systems of government and of life. If we make ourselves superior in living skills to the Germans, to the Italians, and to any other group, then we shall be able to hold our own in competition with them in any field where we may wish to establish the priority of our way of life. So I wish to help contribute to the all-important task of making the American a better American by suggesting a few things I have observed among Northerners and Southerners which may profitably be explored by people of both sections. The Northerner can learn a great deal from the Southerner that will help make him a better American; and the Southerner can likewise learn a lot from the Northerner that will tend to improve his stature as an American. Henry Luce has recently told us that this can be America's century, if we only take advantage of our opportunity in the present position of world affairs. So let us begin by exploring some of the best qualities of both the Northerner and the Southerner.

The logician will probably ask: "What is a Northerner? What is a Southerner?" It is not easy to define a Northerner and a Southerner and yet we must do something about clarifying the vagueness of those two terms. It would be much easier to define, or to describe, an Eng-

lishman, or a Spaniard, or a German, or an Italian, or a Japanese. The Northerner of whom I speak is a man whose political thinking has its roots in the political ideals of Lincoln; his cultural tone is founded on the philosophy of Emerson, and the great New England literary school that Van Wyck Brooks has so ably depicted in "The Flowering of New England." This Northerner has absorbed the business processes of the great financial and industrial empire builders whose stamp is on all our Northern business methods. Such men as James J. Hill and E. H. Harriman, in the railroad world of yesterday; the Rockefellers in the realm of organization of large corporate structures, and the aggressive, efficient, and economical management of them; Carnegie and Schwab and Ford and Chrysler in industrial management and mass production; Wannamaker and Marshall Field have set the Northerners' standards of merchandising, along with Julius Rosenwald who taught the art of bringing the whole country to his store through the mails, and Woolworth who showed how to take his stores to the nation's customers by linking his chains to all parts of the United States. Little wonder is it that the Northerner is so good a business man: what a heritage he has in the great masters of his section who have contributed so vastly to the science of business.

His religion is part character, part intellectual rationalization, part idealism, but very little part emotionalism. He is a stern crusader for the right and is little moved by sentiment, but far more by the compulsion of conviction. He is surrounded everywhere by big things. His are the biggest cities, the biggest buildings, the biggest universities, the biggest factories, the biggest business enterprises—financial, industrial, and commercial. He is more of an urban than rural type, but wherever we find him engaged in agriculture, he operates his farm as a business man and not

merely as "a tiller of the earth." He is an efficient sportsman, not content to play merely for fun—he plays to win, too, and is eager to acquire the best form. He is not a very romantic fellow—he is too practical for overindulgence in a lighter touch of romantic things, but is notoriously a good provider for the woman he marries.

My Southerner belongs to an entirely different heritage. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson are his political patron saints, rather than Lincoln; and while his Northern neighbor may find political inspiration in Theodore Roosevelt and Calvin Coolidge, among the moderns, Woodrow Wilson is the Southerner's concept of the modern great leader. He prefers the classic English scholars for his cultural pattern and has never taken too enthusiastically to the New England titans of literature; and having no great school of literary stars of distinctive Southern cast, he has moulded his intellectual tone largely on the influence of the English classicists. It was a certain provincial citizen of New York who lately described the South, intellectually, as "all wood and a mile wide." Of course he does not know his Southerner very well. Beginning with the era of Jefferson and Madison, in Virginia, and ranging on down through the antebellum period when the slaveholding planter had leisure to become a scholar, and through the more recent intellectual reign in the Congress and Senate of Mississippi's cultivated John Sharp Williams—a product of the Southern environment, with the finishing touch of Heidleberg—the Southerner has been a devotee of learning.

One factor of importance is the very extensive present-day patronage of Northern Universities by Southern boys, and of the best Northern women's colleges by Southern girls, after their preparatory courses in Southern schools. This duality of Southern with Northern educational experience is having a very happy effect on the life and leader-

ship of the South. It would be well if more Northern boys and girls entered Southern schools to superimpose on their Northern preparatory courses, the final touch of Southern atmosphere and life in Southern Universities.

Though industrial development is rapidly spreading throughout the South, the Southerner is still primarily a small business man and a farmer. Indeed, the agricultural influence dominates the whole business and political situation in the South much as the industrial influence permeates the North. Yet, the Southerner has shown a particular aptitude for directing small businesses, in contrast with the dominant emphasis upon big business in the North. It is an interesting and closely related fact that this training in relatively small business concerns has developed an executive status for the Southerner which has become increasingly recognized. In recent years there have been conspicuous instances of Southerners being called to take the helm of many large Northern enterprises in New York, and other great business centers. The Southerner goes into a small business at an early age and he participates in every part of it. Let us take the case of a country boy in a store. He sweeps out in the morning, he does the buying, the selling, the banking, or financing—in fact, he looks at the business as a whole. His Northern counterpart enters a large business employing perhaps thousands. He becomes an expert in some part of the big concern's functions. But he does not see the business as a whole as the Southerner does in the small business. Hence, if the Southerner progresses, he looks upon each larger concern where he casts his fortune from the standpoint of its entire operation, not a small segment of it as does the Northerner. The Northerner is a far more efficient specialist therefore, but the Southerner is better equipped through this experience to manage all of a business, and his friendly manner toward

subordinates enables him to coordinate the efforts of the experts and specialists who have been brought up in a large business where technical efficiency was stressed rather than the generalization that characterizes the small Southern business unit.

In matters of religion the Southerner usually mixes about nine parts emotion with his zeal and faith. He is strong for his particular church, and often feels that it provides the only avenue to salvation. Sometimes one wonders if the Southerner doesn't focus more of his religious thought and affection upon the instrumentality than upon the ideals which the instrumentality was created to propagate. There is no doubt at all that the Southerner is a Partizan. He is not ready to see anything wrong with his church, with his town, with his state, with his friends, with his political party—and woe unto him who would bemean them. The sportsmanship of the Southerner is deeply intermingled with the spirit of partizanship that governs much of his thought and action. He is for his team—is willing to bet on it, travel with it, boost it, help out with its financial problems if necessary, and as a rooter on the sidelines he is the most vocal and enthusiastic of the genus sportsman. Until a comparatively few years ago in the South it was considered undignified for a grown man to play such games as golf and tennis, but such an attitude no longer exists. The traditional Southern sports of hunting and fishing still hold their devotees, but the thousands of participants in other outdoor activities show that the South has become sports minded. The legendary courtliness of the old South has not entirely passed, for the contemporary Southerner maintains many of the ancient courtesies toward the "fair sex." He cherishes a chivalrous attitude toward women that is as beautiful in spirit as it is often impractical.

On the other hand, one receives from the Northerner an impression of practicality and sustained evenness of attitude. The region shouts its stability. And the inhabitants reflect it in their concern for facts, and their disregard for abstract theorizing and daydreaming. The Northern business man will reach his conclusions through a process of reasoning based upon a realistic appraisal of a whole situation. He is not averse to facing the unpleasant as well as the favorable features, and he is quite thorough in searching out tedious details for all of the information he needs to confront his problems. The Northerner may not be so thorough in this respect as the Germans, but he offsets whatever advantage the German may have by greater ingenuity and resourcefulness.

The next great general trait of the Northerner is his initiative. He has an urgent desire for action, once he has studied his facts and determined his course. Coupled with that initiative is courage and daring. The combination has given remarkable and important results. A lengthy record of almost incredible exploits attests to this. To take one example, we may look at the laying of the Atlantic cable. It was a colossal feat, and it required a superabundance of nerve for a person to have conceived and to have had the temerity to tackle for the first time the task of laying a cable on the bottom of the ocean bed for a distance of three thousand miles. Inventive genius is but the sprightly child of initiative. Northern inventive genius has literally revolutionized the entire civilized world. Eliminate the products created by Northern inventive genius and what would be the state of things today? For one thing, we would still be living in a perpetual semi-blackout, for without Edison's electric light we would be in comparative darkness. This one invention has probably added as much to human happiness as any other material contribution in

the entire history of the world. The telephone is another Northern invention. And it required a Northerner to open the way to the development of the great Southern cotton kingdom. Before Eli Whitney devised the cotton gin, it was tragically impossible to distribute the bounty of cotton with anything more than fractional adequacy. Today, cotton forms the base of most of the clothing worn in the world. Mass production, incidentally, was first carried out by Whitney in connection with the manufacture of a large order of guns for the American Army. The automobile is largely a product of Northern initiative. The list could be indefinitely extended.

As a matter of fact the very creation of what we call modern business may be credited in large measure to Northern initiative, daring, courage, and resourcefulness. The growth of the chain-store idea in merchandising, of the mass production system in manufacturing, of research facilities as an adjunct to business enterprise—these are but a few notable developments. The development of the executive delegation of authority to specialists in various departments of business—a feature which is the very essence of modern business—is a Northern principle that has made possible the management of big business on a scale hitherto deemed impossible. These and many more practices which make up the very backbone of business as we know it in the modern world are contributions from Northern men of initiative. They were practical men; they had to be to lay the foundation of the greatest commercial system on the earth.

With these enduring accomplishments, arising out of the qualities of the Northerner above referred to, there have developed certain faults. The chief of these faults is expressed best in the parlance of the street—the Northerner is too cold-blooded in his dealings with his fellow

men. He has never developed that fine art of being gracious which so distinguishes the Southerner. He always thinks in terms of issues and not in terms of people who may be affected by them. I once heard a great Northern industrialist describe how he had recently taken his gigantic concern out of the red by discharging two thousand five hundred employees. His entire emphasis during the conversation was on the red ink he had saved for his corporation, and he apparently gave not the slightest thought to the red blood that was bleeding in the hearts of twenty-five hundred men and their wives and children whom he had deprived of a livelihood by one callous and summary order of dismissal, for which act his whole manner indicated he had not the slightest feeling of compunction.

Coupled with his unprecedented commercial success the Northerner has become entirely too concerned with material things. This manifests itself in many ways. One is in the speed with which he moves about upon the enterprises that absorb his attention. This mad rush is causing him to lose much of the joy in living which a more leisurely mode has brought to the Englishman and to the Southerner. This inordinate lust for money has caused the Northerner to grow old before his time, and the strenuous activity into which he drives himself as well as those around him is shortening the lives of tens of thousands of men each year. The life insurance companies have had a terrific mortality on the holders of large life insurance policies—the jumbo risks whose super-exertions bring heart failure and wrecked nerves and death while they ought to be only in the very prime of life. Yes he makes money—perhaps it would be more accurate, as well as more kind to say that he makes business—his god. Thus he takes himself and his own importance too seriously. A queer outcropping of this is an almost total lack of a sense of humor. Or is

that the reason for the Northerner's humorlessness? Was he not, rather, born without a sense of humor. At any rate, Lord save us from the ordeal of having to listen to a Northerner trying to be humorous—particularly if he is attempting to tell a Negro story. Of course, there are plenty of Northerners with a keen sense of humor, just as there are occasional albinos among the Ethiopians, and here and there a Southern Republican!

If the Northerner lays too much stress upon issues and too little upon personalities, the Southerner exactly reverses the process; to him, the man he is dealing with is everything, the idea is secondary. The Southerner either likes you intensely and loyally, or he dislikes you sharply; there is not much of that middle ground of either neutrality or indifference in his personal relationships. Everything is personal, nothing impersonal with him. He would far rather pay a higher price for something and buy it from someone he likes than get a better bargain from one he dislikes. This trait of the Southerner is at once his strongest and his weakest point. He loves people as individuals, or he heartily dislikes them. His likes and his dislikes, unfortunately are not always based on sound judgments, but often are the result of simple prejudice. He is usually a good judge of people, but his yardstick in judging them is more than likely to be "He is a man I am going to like" or "I wouldn't like that fellow if I knew him a thousand years, and so I won't have anything to do with him." This set of mind is but infrequently changed.

The Northerner, on the other hand, would hardly think to inquire of himself as to whether he liked the person or not. But in his analysis of the values represented by the man for the purpose that was under consideration, the Northerner would place the quality of likability in its proper perspective among his other qualities in a rather

practical appraisal of his abilities and character. If the Southerner likes you, he goes the whole way. He will stick by you through hard times and good; he will go out of his way to do you favors; he will be generous to a fault, financially and otherwise, in his thoughtful consideration of you as his friend. All he expects from you in return is loyalty; undeviating loyalty always. If he ever finds that you have been disloyal in word or deed, then you are "off his list," and more than likely you are off it for good.

That is why the Southerner makes such an ideal friend to one who proves worthy of that friendship. That is why he can be such an enduring and inflexible enemy, too. The boys of Bloody Brethett County are Southern mountaineers, who simply do not forget.

One of the important distinctions between the Northerner and Southerner is that whereas the Southerner likes individuals—he even has devoted friends among individual members of the Negro race—he does not think in terms of the social world as a group; whereas the Northerner, while not so individualistic in his affections, does have a decided feeling for humanity in the mass. As a consequence of this peculiar quirk, the Southerner has built up warm individual friendships among the down-trodden, while he has permitted the mass of them to go largely unattended by any program of group social welfare. On the other hand, the Northerner without particularizing in individual affections has reached out and contributed wisely and constructively to social programs for entire masses of people. This clearly demonstrates his concern for humanity as a whole.

We are wont to speak with sly admiration of the shrewd Yankee, but we have overlooked the shrewd Southerner. A part of his shrewdness consists in his skillful concealment of it. Just as the finest acting on the stage is that

wherein the actor does not appear to be acting at all, so in this matter of shrewdness the same principle might well apply. It would indeed be a very interesting experience to take a typical Vermont farmer and put him up against an Alabama small town business man in some kind of horse trade. Perhaps the Vermonter would start out with the capital of a freshly gathered crop of maple syrup, and the Alabamian with a few bales of cotton. A ringside seat at the "negotiations" would be more valuable than a bid to a king's coronation. I do not know whether Coolidge's fellow Vermonter would end up with enough cotton to keep him in shirts for awhile, but I would gladly wager that the Alabama brother would be pouring maple syrup rather thickly on his breakfast flapjacks for many months to come. It is this native shrewdness that carried the Southerner through the devastation of the Civil War and the terrible aftermath of reconstruction that even more terribly devastated his homeland; it has enabled him to exist in communities with no industries save the meagre ones of "trading and trapping and doing a little farming."

He represents the spirit of independence carried out to its most literal and personal manifestations. One of the reasons he is a small business man is that he doesn't want to work for another person; he prefers to be a small proprietor himself, to being "bossed about" by somebody in a bigger enterprise than his own. He resents intrusion on his rights or whatever he considers his rights, and he will sue you through all the courts if he thinks he is being wronged. One such man has recently carried such a case all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States—which incidentally held against him—on an issue that involved little chance of advantaging him except that he felt his rights were being trampled on.

The great strength of the Southerner lies in his ability to handle people. He is without doubt the world's ablest handler of people. He has an intuitive sense that tells him exactly what to do and say in a given situation where human relations are concerned. The art of building a nation seems to consist in the creation of processes, mechanical and otherwise, for the production of the things that are needed to maintain a civilized standard of living and then in the finding of men who can execute those processes. The Southerner will more and more play his role in the second factor—the management of men. He may not possess his Northern brother's inventive genius, but he does have the gift of a brilliant imagination and qualities of leadership which are in many ways superior to those of the Northerner. We have been depending too much on machines to create and sustain our progress. In a very real sense we have neglected to realize the importance of men in the winning of our Nation's destiny. Many of the problems we face today have been caused by this unfortunate oversight. The management of men—the supplying of that human lubrication which is essential to the smooth, harmonious operation of industry, business, and government —offers an opportunity and a challenge to the Southerner to assume a larger role in the national scene.

It takes a long time for a nation to develop a composite type, and since we are comparatively a young country, the distinctive American pattern has not yet fully unfolded. It is in process, however, and we have many evidences to show that it is. In matters of dress, we are becoming more uniform, thanks largely to the influence of the motion picture. Somebody remarked not long ago after a leisurely automobile trip across the continent, that there are no longer any country-looking people to be found in our rural districts; he noted that country women and girls, in every

section he visited, dressed more nearly like their town and city sisters than was true even a generation ago. It is hard for a man or woman to attend movies regularly for years, and not receive some incentive to dress better—perhaps, unconsciously, to imitate, in some degree, the dress of their favorite actors and actresses. Manners are likewise being inculcated by the visual examples universally provided by the cinema. The trend toward national similarity in speech is influenced both by the talkies and by the radio, and is so rapidly destroying sectional brogues and provincial dialects that one great university has wisely taken the precaution of preserving for posterity the linguistic peculiarities of various localities by obtaining phonograph records of all the typical distinctive modes of speech which until recently had been characteristic of various parts of our big country. Possibly it will take a few more generations yet before the man from Maine is indistinguishable in his speech from the man from South Carolina or Georgia, but surely the trend is in that direction. Our thinking processes are likewise being molded into an increasingly uniform pattern. The wars in Europe and Asia have tended to bind us together more closely upon the common rallying ground of American security. Such common cause is subject to no difference of opinion among us except upon the ways and means by which it may best be furthered. National danger is always a great destroyer of small prejudices. In a world at war the Northerner forgets he is a Northerner, the Southerner forgets he is a Southerner; and both remember that they are at heart brethren, for they are Americans. Our thinking may even yield too much to the suasion of unity in a crisis, for we have found it always better to have at least two strong parties in the United States, and we are now having a hard time maintaining this two party system. As the South enters more

completely upon its course of industrialization the Southerners' views on the tariff issue might conceivably shift, thus relegating one time-honored issue to the scrap heap. It is interesting to observe also, that some of the most ardent advocates of state's rights are today Northerners and some of the most bizarre practitioners of the Hamiltonian principle of a strong centralized government, are Southerners.

There is another point of high ground upon which the thinking of Northerner and Southerner meets in unison: it is their unbounded faith in the future of America. This faith could never be shaken by the avalanche of war, the blight of depression, or the threat of rival ideologies. The Northerner and Southerner stand side by side on the granite rock of faith in their country. Without knowing the vastness of its wealth, they stake their lives, their fortunes, great or small, their children's future, in its bounty; without realizing the strength, they challenge the whole world to stand aside from interference in their destiny; and if any man among them be of little faith he is chastised by public sentiment with a scourge as ruthless as that employed by the stern old preacher who upbraided a congregation gathered on a drouth stricken Texas prairie to pray for rain because no one among them except himself had enough faith to bring along an umbrella.

Of course the infusion of foreign immigation into our country on an unlimited and unrestricted scale for several generations prolonged the process of developing the composite American type, and greatly complicated it as well. It remains to be seen whether we were too indulgent in our ideal of providing a haven for the oppressed from any and all other lands. While much of our sturdiness of character is the result of both the blend of blood and the environmental influence of alien culture flowering in the

sunlight of our own democratic way of life, it is a fact that much of the crime, much of the subversive activities, much of the reversion to abortive old-world retrogression with which our country is infested, derives from foreign elements that are ungrateful for the shelter we afforded them from the untold wrongs in the countries of their nativity.

One of the common weaknesses of both the Northerner and the Southerner is his provincialism; though citizens of the greatest of the world empires—if we use the word empire in its broadest connotation—he has great difculty in thinking in international terms. He cannot bring himself to feel that the dictum "No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself" applies to nations as well as to individuals, that it applies to his nation as well as to all other nations. To the average American, both North and South, the affairs of Europe and of Asia are hardly more significant, however catastrophic, than their interest or non-interest in matters of news. He reads the column about his favorite baseball team and its struggle with its rival for the league pennant, with equal or greater avidity than he peruses the column of the war correspondent describing a far-off battle on another continent. He does not know that this battle, however geographically distant, may almost as well be raging in the street in front of his home, if its impact upon his life, and that of his children be his matter of concern. He cannot seem to get the feel of his place and his country's place in the scheme of modern world affairs. Following a brief interlude of international mindedness during the first World War, he almost immediately reverted to type when the peace was signed; and, ostrich like, hid his head in the sand of his own provincialism. There is an irreconcilable inconsistency between his immense pride and faith in his country

and his stubborn unwillingness to let her assume the responsibility and attain the glory of world leadership.

Perhaps his gullibility is as much to blame as his provincialism for his failure to allow his country to play her proper role in world affairs. He thinks that all men, all races and nations, have the same peaceful, non-aggressive attitudes as he has, as his country has. And so, as soon as one war or series of wars is over in some far continent, he demands of his congressman that he vote to reduce the American Army to a Corporal's Guard, that the government sink the proud ships of our navy as a peace gesture, and that we become as insipid as a gargoyle, as shineless and defenseless as a rabbit. Even when the C. C. C. camps were proposed a few years ago, a great clamor arose both North and South against their creation, for fear the boys would learn to become soldiers; and it was only after assurances were given that these C. C. C. camps would not become military training posts could the law creating them be passed.

It cannot too often be stressed that we are in competition with the dictatorships not only in a military sense, but, more broadly, in our way of life. We project a method of living which we claim distributes happiness more completely and more widely than does the method they offer in their proposed "New Order." But, we are too prone to feel that our way of life has attained the ultimate—to become self-satisfied, complacent, unrealistic about it. We clearly see the faults of their regimented system, but we do not as clearly see the faults of our system based on the several freedoms that we cherish. We must see the faults of our own order, and proceed to improve it. To do so we need to synchronize the cultures of both North and South—to fuse the virtues of the Northerner and Southerner, and thus produce a better American than either;

for after all, a better way of life is possible only by producing a better type of American. The stern New Englander, he of the Puritan conscience, the intolerant superiority complex—who formed the Abolitionist group of Civil War days has passed from us. So, too, has his more recent prototype, the high protective tariff Brahmin of our own times, lost caste as a factor in national thought. We have yet among us the Northerner whose horizon is bounded by the Hudson River on the west and who is so busy dealing unimaginatively with his prosaic facts, and scheming to pile up more money, that he has forgotten or has never learned the art of extracting from life its finer and truer values. The Southern hot head who plunged headlong into controversy or catastrophe without much thought beforehand, has likewise largely become a figment of tradition but we still have with us the friendly and contented Southerner, who complacently votes "regular" the straight Democratic ticket, and fortifies his spirit with straight Bourbon whiskey the more vociferously to propound his seductive prejudices. But these men cannot evolve that way of life which must hold its own in competition with turbulent systems wherein force combines with efficiency and aggressiveness joins brainpower in conquering new frontiers of opportunity and achievement for people. No, the old American complacency must go, the spirit of freedom must be retained at all costs, but the excesses of freedom must be stripped off. We must get down to business with this job of making the blessings of our way of life more broadly available to the masses, and more abundantly and progressively possible for the underprivileged. This will require an extension of our social consciousness beyond the metes and bounds of our past concepts. We will have to work more for the well-being of the whole country and less for the private and selfish interests which heretofore have

bounded our interests and activities. It is not a socialist state we must create, it is a socialized conscience which we must cultivate. The composite American must thus be cast in a nobler mold to measure up to this broadened concept of responsibility. The best virtues of the Northerner must therefore be blended with the best virtues of the Southerner, and the age-old faults of each allowed to atrophy. Thus will be created the composite American; and he will be able to challenge the whole world by the quality of the civilization which he produces.

ROBERT C. RHODES has been Professor of Biology at Emory University since 1917. He is a member of the 1906 graduating class of Henderson-Brown, and he received his graduate training at Vanderbilt (A.B., 1907; A.M., 1908) and the University of California (Ph.D., 1917). He has done additional work with the University of Chicago and the Marine Biology Laboratory. From 1908 to 1910 he was instructor of biology at Mississippi University, and in 1910 he was promoted to an assistant professorship. In 1912 he returned to Henderson-Brown as Vice President and Professor of Science. He left Henderson-Brown in 1915 to accept an assistantship at the University of California and to complete his work for the doctorate. Two years later he was appointed to the professorship which he now holds. He was made head of the Department of Biology when he went to Emory.

Dr. Rhodes's interest in biology has been social as well as scientific. An ordained minister, he has shown wide interest in the study of the improvement of mankind. His particular field of interest has been genetics and eugenics. He has held the presidency of the Georgia Academy of Sciences and of the Association of Southeastern Biologists. He is a member of the American Society of Zoologists, the American Eugenics Society, the American Genetics Society, and the American Society of Parasitologists.

The following essay by Dr. Rhodes, "Some Biological Factors Involved in Democracy," presents his views on the prospects for a better democracy through a more careful control of human heredity.

SOME BIOLOGICAL FACTORS INVOLVED IN DEMOCRACY

ROBERT C. RHODES

Professor and Head of the Department of Biology at Emory University

DEMOCRACY rests upon the biological foundations of a basic level of human intelligence, an individual self-determination, and a willingness to design a system of self-government for mutual benefit and general welfare which will not only serve the present but maintain its purpose and effectiveness through successive generations. These basic requirements must be present to insure any democracy of even greatly modified type.

A *pure democracy* might be sufficient and satisfactory for a small body of people of similar genetic natures; of relatively simple living; of like purposes, public opinion, and ideals, in which the least government would be considered the best. With growing complexity and differentiation of activities and increasing division of labors, any government would probably have to be stronger, with larger duties to perform and delegated powers to handle the problems of a larger population. Such a situation calls for a *representative form of government.* To guarantee the rights and general welfare, "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" of all people qualified in the more limited spheres of influence for participating in a pure democracy, a *"constitutional democracy"* has been attempted in these United States of America and we at present are supposed to be functioning under such a government.

A representative, constitutional democracy is characterized by several fundamental principles. In such a democracy, all powers of government are ultimately

derived from the consent of the governed. Those governing and governed are considered to be those qualified for citizenship in a pure democracy, not all the people living within a given territory. Others living within the same geographic area and not qualifying for citizenship would be the "wards" of democracy. The citizens, through their government, would be the trustees for such. Universal citizenship within an area and universal suffrage are impossible biological assumptions for democracy.

Some say this has been settled by the Civil War. But nothing is settled finally until all evidence is complete and until it is settled right. Self-determination is biologically a prerequisite to the simplest form of democracy. Those not self-determining must be considered the "impediments" of any government, especially a democracy. Representation is based upon self-determining, conscious delegations of power, not assumption of power by self-appointment either by individuals or by government. Those not qualifying for simple citizenship, by organismal capacity as well as acquired and achieved criteria, cannot be legislated or constitutionally amended into democratic citizenship.

Under some pseudo-humanitarian philosophies, it is believed that universal education and specific conditioning can make of any human being a good citizen. An intellectually deficient individual could be made to care for himself and under social control to possibly support himself. But such reasoning is based upon the supposition that it takes all kinds of people to make up a community and the world in which every individual is a citizen. The very premises involved here exclude the possibility of a democratic community or state. Self-determination of the governed is a *sine qua non* of democracy.

There is a serious biological question involved in the problem of the possibility of a true democracy in any state composed of two or more racial types. Laws are passed, services rendered, and regulations made upon the general assumption that they will normally have an equal effect and response upon all the people. Family and racial inequalities will soon make well intentioned laws and policies special privileges to some, and an unequal burden and injustice upon others.

In a very real sense, under many circumstances the welfare of the people is of more importance than the will of the people. But in a democracy the reverse is fundamentally true, the will of the people is of more importance than the welfare of the people, or democracy will perish. Upon the wisdom and judgment of the people in being able and willing to achieve the welfare of the people depends much of the survival value of democratic government.

In complex questions involving the needs and welfare of the people, not every citizen is qualified to come to an understanding of every, many, or even most questions; so good, cooperative citizens must be willing to delegate to their representatives the duty to properly investigate all such questions and problems and vote for or against such measures as, in their own judgment, will be the right or best solution to the problem involved. A representative of the people is not justified in voting, according to the authorized poll of a majority of an electorate. His vote should reflect his own judgment, and not his own interest. Unless representatives of the people follow this pattern of duty, they are unworthy of the authority and trust invested in them.

A constitutional democracy is, in its very essence, a curb upon the existing majority. The immediate will of

the majority can only be exercised within the jurisdictional prescriptions of the constitution. The government of a constitutional democracy, therefore, should probably function only through its delegated powers. Should the central government persist in initiating and exercising extra constitutional powers, democracy is to that extent dead or inactive. No general delegation of such general powers of initiation of policies and programs should be made unless the same are limited in time and circumstances.

A biologist here hopes to combine a philosophy and political science into an analysis of organismal aspects of government. He would present a brief synthesized and constructive view of the essential biological nature of the democracy of the United States of America.

No partisanship is intended and no emotional sanction for any fixed form of government, or past or present policies. No appeal is made for the civil liberty of academic freedom. Free speech may be a good public policy, but it has little ethical or scientific value and is not an inalienable right. The fundamental human organismal need in this respect is the opportunity to search for and discover the truth, and then the privilege to live in conformity with it. Truth is not discovered by assertion. No man should ever be forced to obey a law which involves or is based upon scientifically provable error. Every governmental constitution should incorporate this principle.

This government is a product of individual design and social evolution. It was founded in human need. It expressed the aspirations of many. It has never claimed to be infallible. It is subject to change. That it began as a democracy and after a century and a half still claims to be one, is the result of the wisdom of its founders, the nature of its people, and the world environment of which it is a part. To survive through the coming centuries, it must

face every reality, old or newly discovered, and must be the product of a succession of men and women of intelligent design, willing to be unselfish and faithful citizens of a planned democracy. Scientific principles and social policies taught twenty-five years ago are now being put into practice in society and government. Such a cultural lag is probably desirable. A better understanding of the methods of evolution and the march of progress in the fields of genetics and eugenics lead us to inquire as to whether it is now possible to objectively regulate the nature of human life through successive generations, and whether a democracy such as ours can hope to begin regulation of the nature of its own people and within limits direct the nature of its population to some goal constitutionally or by legislation relatively fixed. These may be regarded as the suggestions of a biologist to be incorporated into our government at the earliest possible time. If these things are taught in our schools, colleges, and universities of today, tomorrow they may become a part of our majority opinion and become enthroned as a part of our state policies.

Four biological principles are involved in a representative, constitutional democracy subject to the will of its citizens:

First. Self-perpetuating *human organisms* constitute the supreme reality in all human affairs. The state is the product of the life of the human organism. Human life is not a product of the state. *Man is the basis of all government.*

Second. *Men* are *not* born *equal,* and seldom ever achieve equality. Equality of opportunity only results in greater inequalities.

Third. The emphasis must remain upon *local individual self-determination* with successive and ever enlarg-

ing regional authorities until the final representative constitutional government is achieved. This central government might be strong, but it must be created with *delegated powers,* and *limited in time and circumstances.* Otherwise it is very doubtful that a true democracy can exist and survive as such through the centuries.

Fourth. It is necessary, in order to have an enduring government, for democracy to *regulate the nature of its people,* not only as the determinate citizens of today, but especially the citizens of tomorrow and through successive generations.

Each of these principles is now to be considered.

First. *Man the basis of all government.* Primarily democracy is a government of and by the people. Man is biologically an organism of varied levels of intelligence, but fundamentally of a basic level of intelligence of such a nature as to possess intelligent design and be self-determining. By this quality he has gained a mastery over physical forces of nature and all other organisms. The problem we face today is as to whether he can extend this supremacy over himself and become truly self-determining. Much of his victory over nature and other organisms has come through his willingness to cooperate with others for mutual benefit and racial welfare. Upon these innate qualities of men rests the biological justification of democracy as a type of government. Individual human organisms, perpetuating themselves through successive generations, represent the fundamental realities of human life, human values, human institutions, and human relationships. Monarchies, feudal systems, caste systems, and dictatorships, except with the consent of the majority governed, are biologically questionable and in the long run fallacious.

An interesting consideration is involved here. A majority of a democracy may not be able to find out what

is wise to do and they may selfishly be unwilling to do what is wise even when such a course can be determined. It is for this reason that democracies as well as other types of governments and institutions and civilizations have tottered and fallen. While democracy is primarily a government *of* and *by* the people, it must be for the people as well. And this must be truly *for* the *people* not only of today, but of *tomorrow* and the race to be, or else biological elimination will as surely mark man as unfit, as it did the trilobites or the giant mesozoic reptiles. Unwise majorities or minorities will wreck any government or institution. The dawn of the new day offers many conclusive proofs that man's nature is such that minority castes and dictators may have their day, but their doom is sure, for men will not consent to be economic or governmental robots, doing the dirty work of the world for minorities to enjoy leisure and opportunities, "serene highnesses sitting in place esplanade and eating while music plays," inflated plutocrats and egotists riding in limousines over cobble stones of human misery. Democracy is a good form of government, probably the best and biologically justified, but its persistence is based upon *survival values,* the expression of wise ideals and judgments of and by the people and for racial welfare. The right to rule is only divine as it gives opportunities for fuller development to human organisms, intelligently designed for well rounded and better personalities not only for this generation, but through untold generations to come.

A super-state as a super-reality, speculatively assumed to have innate rights, is the artificial, unscientific, and unjustified spectre of socialism. We believe that democracy is a biologically justified form of government, since it is based upon the nature of the human organism, and

that socialism is based upon an artificially assumed and scientifically unsound fallacy.

Second. *Men are not born equal.* The philosophy of early democracies that "All men are created free and equal," can no longer be held as true and a new basis for government of, by, and for the people must be found. This philosophy is in some respects the greatest stumbling block to the safety and preservation of a democratic form of government. *Equality of opportunity* creates greater difference throughout development and is as unjust to the better individual as to the worst. "Full opportunity for full development" is the fallacious slogan most heard today harking back to the false doctrine of equality. "Full opportunity for full development" to those who do not conform to democracy's ideal for her future citizens would mean the negation of progress and the destruction of any purposefulness on the part of democracy through successive generations. For imbeciles, morons, criminally inclined men, and fundamentally different types to have full opportunity for full development, encouragement to reproduce their kind, would lead to the breakdown of any government based on the consent of the governed. Democracy cannot be all things to all kinds of people. It can only hope to succeed as it seeks to give equality of opportunity to those of sufficiently like kind and these must be of the better, not the worst.

It is a fact that parents of mediocre and low intelligence sometimes produce good and outstanding citizens and that superior parents often beget morons and imbeciles. Such phenomena are in conformity with Mendelian and Neo-Mendelian principles. Latent and recessive genes can be determined in various family lines by genetic studies extending at least through five to seven generations. It will not be necessary to eliminate an otherwise normal

and good genetic complex because it has one or more undesirable traits, but the genotypic nature of each family and individual should be so well determined that advice as to mates could be given, which if followed for five generations would tend to reduce and often eliminate such defects.

Of more significance than this, however, it will be apparent that a thousand children of parents of the highest ten per cent level of the population would develop a far larger number of normal and superior citizens than a thousand children of the lowest ten per cent.

Third. *Local self-determination with government of delegated powers.* The interpretation of the general welfare clause in the United States constitution is significant. If "delegated powers" is to be continued as the basis of Federal authority, there is little justification for the assumption of authorities by the Federal Government—even with the consent of the Supreme Court. Any and every piece of legislation considered could easily come under the Federal jurisdiction with such a basic assumption of "general welfare." Even the elimination of all local government might be so assumed if a select personnel in the Supreme Court might so rule by a "majority of one" decision.

It does seem that the purpose of the Federal Government as stated in the constitution might well be for the general welfare, but this would not guarantee all authority to such a Federal Government. It would rather serve to suggest certain authorities as desirable to be delegated to the Federal Government by proper constitutional methods.

The necessity for democracy to function from the will of the local self-governments, based upon individual judgment, up to the Federal Government for the general wel-

fare and equalization of justice to all, is based upon this fact.

Many recent "reforms" involved the distribution of Federal funds for local projects. Whoever holds the purse strings will finally resort to regulation of services and in time to the initiation of the same. Such a government could no longer be a true representative, constitutional democracy, but would be a paternalistic and bureaucratic dictatorial authority. It would not represent an achievement of a socialized democracy, but would tend to be a government recognizing the supremacy of the state. There is great similarity in governments recognizing "the supremacy of the state," no matter what the form or name that might be assumed. "Socialized Democracy" and "National Socialism," if based upon the supremacy and ultimate reality of the state would be alike in that they could not be democracies.

Loose political interpretations of such basic constitutional rights and guarantees for a representative constitutional democracy are dangerous. A few willful leaders might grasp unthought-of powers and under the pretense of general welfare might completely undermine the will of the people and then subject and condition all to the will of a few or even one. This might easily lead to some form of dictatorship and prove the end of constitutional democracy.

The general welfare of the people is biologically, socially, and politically a basic principle of government. It is very difficult, with all evidence, to determine just what policies will result in this desired end. It might be secured under many different kinds of government. But in this consideration we are forced to consider its effect upon our democracy.

What is for the welfare of some individual organism is not for the welfare of others. The same is true when applied to families, economic groups, territorial units, and even to successive generations.

There is a strong probability that the general welfare of the individuals of a small pure democracy could best be interpreted and secured by an intelligent local authority. But in a large country such as ours with divergent interests and yet a unity of purpose—justice to all and an emphasis upon the best—many things cannot be satisfactorily done and many conditions cannot be met except by the force and power of a unified and qualified central government. It is for these reasons that the Federal Government was organized. Powers were delegated to this government and implemented under the constitution. Unless this Federal Government has now grown so undemocratic that it is jealous of local autonomy and is no longer willing to live within its delegated powers, in the interest of the preservation of self-determination every added authority for specific purposes should be sought and granted, but should definitely be limited in time to guarantee a return of that authority to the people where it belongs. Only the specifically delegated powers which are considered legitimate and permanent should be exercised within the constitutional authority. Others which are desired for specific purposes should be granted on a term basis and should terminate automatically. This seems the only way to guarantee the efficient functioning of a democracy which can persist as such. Democracy in action can change to another form of government very easily, and leave the government only a democracy in name. Local autonomy thus demands a jealous guardianship as the basis of an interested and intelligent citizenship. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The general welfare of the whole people might

thus be said to rest in local self-determination. When larger problems affecting all groups within the national area need the regulation and enforcement of the central government, such "powers" should be delegated by a wise local autonomy. Revolution would more likely result by assumption of authority than by delay in the delegation of powers.

When various minorities seek their own interests by devious means and resort to pressure groups, they take from their constitutional representatives the very essence of their being. To create public opinion is desirable, but to demand that representatives in a democracy be subservient to vociferous and excessively energetic demands of minorities by group pressure or political wire pulling or mass letter writing is destructive to the integrity of majority opinion of intelligent, honest, and qualified representatives. The rights of minorities are guaranteed by the constitutional limitations upon the majority and the balance of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. To submit to political, economic, or religious pressure groups and attempt to make the will of a minority the law of the land will destroy the basic principle of representative democracy.

Fourth. *Democracy must regulate the nature of its people.* The most important question for any social group, government, or people is the nature of the population. This population problem involves the nature of life that is manifest in the individual and the nature of life through successive generations.

It used to be said with much emphasis that the world doesn't owe anyone a living. But at present every man, woman, and child in the United States is being given a living—food, clothes, shelter, and many other essentials

and non-essentials. Our government under the New Deal is guaranteeing the same to all people within our boundaries. Our government has to this extent become a Mutual Public Service Corporation. The old idea in government and economic policy was "Out of universal self-seeking would come the good of all," but in fact, instead, came the good of a few. The New Deal in government seems to be an effort at a planned and self-regulated life of its people. The economic principles of supply and demand and "increased purchasing power" are but social efforts to meet human needs. A fuller program is needed if human welfare is to be attained and perpetuated and human life is to be planned, regulated, and directed.

From a genetic standpoint, the one thing desirable for any eugenic program at present is: "The registration and classification of the whole population." We are now a nation of some thirty-five million families. Counting each family as closely related to nine others there are probably less than three million family lines, and these more or less interrelated. Such a registration would serve as a survey of the present nature of our people. A check on the outstanding characteristics as well as on any detrimental qualities could be secured for at least three generations. Only seven generations are necessary to give a convincing segregation and distribution of traits which would enable each individual to be known genetically, even genotypically, to such an extent that wisdom could prevail in falling in love, and falling out of love.

The American people dislike being finger printed, but this may be because of its association with criminals. If it becomes a universal practice, only those could be expected to object who would desire secrecy for fear of detection in unsocial practices.

A normal classification of the population would naturally follow such a registration. Recognizing not less than three fundamental races of men, these should be designated with ratings of superior, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and bad within each. All known recognized tests of human personality should be used to determine those in each race and group who are below a basic level of physical well being and intelligence. We assume that most unsocial traits can be overcome by individual conditioning. The upper twenty-five per cent should be determined if possible so that opportunity might be given them for the production of a larger number of the next generation without this being a liability. The lowest ten per cent should be dealt with firmly but fairly, that they might not willingly or ignorantly curse children not yet born.

The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, while containing some values, are primarily based upon the untrue philosophy of the equality of all men. While those Amendments remain unmodified or unrepealed, even though they are not enforced, it is the technical and constitutional expression of an ideal of America as a human melting pot. This was not the purpose of the founders of our nation. This has been a political discard now for more than a quarter of a century, since our immigration policy recognizes this fallacy and follows a nearer approach to the truth in its national origins clause. The repeal of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments would tend to clarify the situation immensely. It would then be possible *to give expression to an ideal of what we should like to see and have a right to expect the citizens of America to be a hundred or a thousand years from now.*

A state exists only when a group of people within a geographic territory are of such similar nature, ideals,

and practices as to be able to cooperate for mutual welfare. One of Wilson's Fourteen Points for settling the World War was based upon the principle that national boundaries should coincide with racial unity. The German national program states in essence that "A German citizen can be only one of German blood." The American policy of including as citizens all born within our borders or naturalized is the negation of any high idealism based upon racial differences among men. American citizenship might well be limited to those of the Caucasian race. Laws could then be made giving opportunities to these and placing an emphasis upon the best that progress might be made toward a better type of man and citizen. When this is done, a national home for the negroes within our borders or elsewhere should be found and opportunity for self-determination and full development for them provided there and guaranteed over a number of years. The necessity of giving expression to an ideal of what an American citizen should be is desirable and prerequisite for the efficient planning and working of any just program. Democracy cannot be all things to all men. Those who would try to make democracy serve this purpose would inevitably destroy it. Democracy must provide the best for the best, as well as raise the standards of the better and eliminte the worst.

A sufficient majority can do anything in a democracy in due course of time. But this does not insure the success of everything done. We can retain our present constitutional guarantee of the melting pot ideal or enthrone an ideal of racial unity within our borders with an emphasis upon the best as the highest type of humanitarianism.

Consideration of the nature of the citizen of tomorrow has up to the present been by indirection. We have objectively sought and obtained various types of plants and

lower animals by direct methods of obtaining the same. To attempt as much in the realm of our own lives and in the production of children would be *a new deal for the citizen of tomorrow.* We have been content to allow individuals to choose their own mates and with pride in our philosophy of individualism have almost accepted the fallacious slogans that all men are created equal, that all should be given equality of opportunity, that every type should be given full opportunity for full development, and that it is the inalienable right of every man and woman to reproduce his or her own type. The social policies of universal education; religious liberty; freedom of speech, of press, and of public meeting; economic opportunities; and political equality, have been trusted as the methods by which the nature of man might be elevated to hitherto unknown heights. And now we are beginning to see the superstructures built upon these fallacious and unscientific speculations and philosophies crumbling toward ruin and threatening to carry civilization to the brink of another dark age. To the blind faith in universal education as a panacea for human ills, to the economic quack urging conformity to unregulated distribution by supply and demand, and to the political demagogue urging equality of opportunity, we can no longer leave the determination of the production of children. It is an opportune time to ask for direction instead of indirection, for the application of scientific principles instead of philosophic speculations, for the cessation of *laissez-faire* attitudes and the adoption of the best direct methods at our disposal to give the citizens of tomorrow at least a good chance to be what they should be. An unwillingness to adopt direct methods affecting the nature of man by heredity is a deliberate choice to allow his nature to be determined by indirect factors. One major factor has been the economic system

resulting in an aristocracy of wealth today. Man must no longer be willing to allow himself to be the servant of, and his children determined by, the economic system, by indirection, but should set himself definitely to make the economic system the servant of man. The biologist may have his individual preferences for one economic system above another, but fundamentally there is one criterion he is willing to accept as the measuring rod for any social order. This measuring rod is "human value." "Does it meet human need? Does it promote human welfare and progress?" When our social leaders and economists tell us that we must adapt human personality to meet existing economic systems, we prefer to raise up another breed of economists more after the heart of the biologists.

Enough is known at present of the nature of man, his evolution and heredity, and of the scientific principles involved to warrant an attempt at objective and direct regulation of his nature. Certainly more could be expected of such an effort than simply allowing other less direct factors to determine what man shall be. Emphasis would thus be placed upon personality and the nature of man through successive generations. A consideration of this is not merely justified, but is desirable.

Doesn't it seem strange then that in this age of biological progress and knowledge that men high in scientific and governmental circles should claim that since we know so little about the heredity of man that we should allow his nature to be determined by economic factors, religious and personal prejudice and superstition, political demagogery, and other individual and social factors, the action of which on the nature of man through successive generations is less known and less determinable than the little we know of human heredity. The smallness of our knowledge

of human heredity in no way justifies our using other factors, by indirection, about which we are vastly ignorant.

Much doubt may exist about many biological principles as they apply to man, but there can be little doubt as to the possibility of the elimination of the unfit and the placing of an emphasis upon the best by the method of "parent selection."

In the realm of plant and animal husbandry this method of "pedigree selection" has been approved and put into practice throughout the world. It is resulting in the production of a large number of new plants and animals to conform to the wishes and needs of men. The mechanism involved in the process of heredity is so well understood that those in a position to know believe that pedigree selection can be depended upon as a law by which man may live. It is as reliable as most natural laws or adopted techniques of science. Scientific doubt can no longer be used as an alibi to prevent man adopting this technique personally and socially in his own life.

Without an understanding of the causes underlying the first appearance of those variations or modifications which we call mutations and which are incorporated into the life stream of whatever organism in which they appear, it is with confidence and certainty that we are able to predict the transmission of such traits through successive generations.

The institution through which the above program can be accomplished is *marriage*. The state has full power of regulation and control of this contract, by right of its interest as a party of the third part and also by right of being the trustee of the children who might be born as parties of the fourth part. Proper restrictions are being introduced rapidly and our people are becoming "parent

conscious." As never before, there is a willingness to see that every child shall have the right to be well born.

Maternity and paternity clinics, where information on birth control and related phenomena of the marriage relation can be had, would make it possible for parents to have children when they desire them and when the health of the mother and the economic resources and other factors are most favorable. There is no justification that children should be born as the product of ignorance and passion.

A very important though negative part of the program of self-determination and regulation is now legally recognized in a majority of the states. I refer to sterilization. This does not unsex the individual, but merely prevents the reproduction of undesirable types of organisms. The majority of the members of a democracy above the basic level of intelligence, would voluntarily submit to sterilization if facts warranted the same. For those who were intellectually or emotionally incapable of understanding or acting for the best interests of society, the state would have to enforce sterilization. When in doubt do not sterilize.

A democracy, by nature of group cooperative effort for mutual welfare, has every right to defend itself against attacks or dangers, both from without and from within. Organismally the individual who is unprepared to guarantee to himself the essentials of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness by individual effort is likely to be among those discarded. So a nation or government which does not provide for group life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness is likely to prove to be unfit. Nationalism and patriotism are two realities which have been challenged by superficial thinkers because there have been many perversions of each; much done in the name of each which was bigoted and selfish. But the greatest values and virtues

are always subject to perversions without themselves being invalidated. Nationalism and patriotism are two essential virtues and should be cultivated, not condemned, by a peace loving people, under the form of a democratic government seeking the permanent welfare of the human organism.

There is a need that Man apply himself unstintingly and unselfishly to a conscious and controlled organization of the world for an organized Society of Nations composed of peoples of various types, with a designated national home for each worthwhile and recognized type of man. This can only be by people of Intelligent Design. Until the world becomes safe for Democracy, we have plenty to do to set our own house in order, that our Democracy will take advantage of her opportunity to determine the nature of her population.

In a fixed and relatively small world, the races of men must live or die in conformity with the natural laws of heredity and variation, subject to the survival values of organic evolution. Instead of ruthless survival of the fittest by might, we suggest the substitution of the Principle of Intelligent Design. Man's nature calls for conscious, controlled, and unselfish effort in contrast to unconscious, uncontrolled, and selfish lives of lower organisms. Man's superiority can thus be measured by being, instead of getting.

Many other problems related to the self-determination of a people through successive generations might be introduced. The march of time has disclosed enough facts upon which wisdom and justice might join hands in controlling the nature of the population. We in America await an enlightened leadership which will direct public opinion into these channels that wisdom and justice dictate.

HOWARD A. DAWSON is an authority in the field of rural education. He has written numerous articles, reports, and surveys in this field; and his book, *Satisfactory Local School Units,* is the original authoritative publication on that subject. Dr. Dawson received his education at Henderson-Brown College (1915-1917) and at Peabody (B.S. and M.A., 1924; Ph.D., 1926). In 1926 he returned to Arkansas as head of the research division of the State Department of Education. While serving in this capacity, he carried on a successful campaign for the consolidation of rural schools. The consolidation reduced the number of school districts from 5,200 to 3,000 and increased high school attendance in the state by one-third. In his later years with the Department of Education he served as a consultant for the National Survey of School Finance and for the Kentucky Education Commission. He was also called to act as a member of the National Conference on the Emergency Financing of Education in 1933; and a year later he was asked to become advisor for the National Committee for Federal Aid for Education.

In 1935 he became assistant director of research for the National Education Association. The following year he was made Director of the Division for Rural Service of the same organization. He has later served as executive secretary of the Legislative Commission of the National Education Association, and as executive secretary of the Association's Department of Rural Education.

Dr. Dawson has recently done extensive work on the problem of Federal aid for state primary and secondary education. His article, "Public Education in the South: Status and Needs," gives an analysis of the relative status of Southern schools.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH: STATUS AND NEEDS

HOWARD A. DAWSON
Director of Rural Service
National Education Association
Washington, D. C.

PRIOR TO THE WAR between the States the southern aristocracy, supported by slavery and surrounded by a disfranchised and propertyless class of poor whites, looked with hostility upon public education as advocated by Jefferson.[1] After the war the struggle for economic existence made the establishment of public schools a long, tedious, arduous task. Although the idea of free universal public schools is now firmly rooted in the South, the great frontier in American public education today is the establishment and maintenance of a fair standard of educational opportunity in the South.

According to the Jeffersonian idea, universal public education is an essential function of the state: This government was launched upon the principle that it is a government "of the people, by the people, for the people." The final authority over our government rests upon the popular will expressed by ballot. Consequently it is necessary that the state provide the means through which each individual may acquire the knowledge, the attitude, and the will necessary to exercise intelligently the privilege of suffrage. Considered in this way the public schools are the agency through which the democratic state undertakes to perpetuate itself. Public education, then, has a political purpose, one so fundamental that the benefits of education cannot be permitted to be determined by the poverty or affluence of the family, or the community.

Public education also has an economic function. Wealth is created by the application of human labor and skill to natural resources. In the last analysis wealth and well-being can be increased only by improving the knowledge, skill, physical fitness, and character of the people. "Nations have grown rich and powerful in the absence of outstanding physical resources by developing their human assets. Others have remained poor and backward in the presence of unusual natural resources. . . . A careful administered system of education significantly increases the intelligence and efficiency of labor." [2] Education then is the *sine qua non* of economic prosperity.

But education has a much more fundamental function than the increasing of the national wealth and the expanding of the earning power of the individual. It is the only sure road to self-respect and freedom. "Moreover, the complications of the present-day culture demand that those who live in it must keep abreast of it, not only that they may survive individually but that they may not retard the advancement of the group through their inability to cooperate." [3]

It is in the light of the philosophy expressed in the foregoing paragraphs that the status and needs of public education in the South [4] will be examined.

II

When the gross facts of the status of public education in the South are compared to the facts for other sections of the nation, it becomes clear that for the masses of the people in the South there is a great deficiency in both the quantity and quality of education. It is, however, all too easily concluded by many people that there are no good schools in the South. Nothing can be further from the truth. There are many excellent schools in any one of

the Southern States. An accurate statement is that there are in the South many of the best and a multitude of the worst schools to be found in the nation. It is probably true that the average southern city school system is as good as the average city system in other sections of the country. It is also quite noteworthy that in recent years the outstanding efforts to improve the curriculum of the schools have taken place in Southern States, notably in Virginia, Arkansas, Florida, and Alabama.

Southern States have made the most superior effort in the nation to improve their school organization. Although only about half of the rural pupils of the nation are in these States, they have 56 per cent of the nation's consolidated schools.[5] In the matter of administrative organization and personnel the Southern States are by no manner of means the most backward of the States. Nine of the fourteen are primarily organized as county units of school administration, and eight of them select their county superintendents by boards of education, not by popular election.[6] In Arkansas, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas the schools are administered, and to a large extent supported financially, through numerous local school districts, thousands of them being only large enough to afford a one-teacher school. In Arkansas and Mississippi there are actually more school board members than there are teachers, and in Oklahoma, Texas, and South Carolina there are more than half as many board members as teachers.[7] These small districts cause great and unnecessary differences in the burden of local school taxes, produce the grossest kind of inequalities of educational opportunity, and make practically impossible the efficient management and operation of the schools.

The Southern States lead the nation in the extent to which they depend upon *State* financial support of public

schools in contradistinction to *local* support. In 10 of the 14 states, *State* funds for elementary and secondary schools exceed 40 per cent of the total funds available for that purpose as compared with less than 30 per cent for the nation as a whole. Only one of the 14 falls below the national average.[8] There is no one of the Southern States that has not enacted substantial legislation for financial equalization of school support for a fixed minimum standard of educational opportunity. As to methods of distributing school funds the majority of these States compare favorably with any of the other States and far excel most of them.[9]

At least 9 of the 14 Southern States can be classed among the States of the Union that have done the most to modernize their systems of taxation, a large part of the benefits of which goes to the support of education. As measured by diversity of taxes, sources of revenue utilized, and rates levied on those sources, these states rank above most of the other States of the Union. Not only do they levy death taxes, incomes taxes, luxury taxes, and the like, but they lay the highest rates on gasoline, cigarettes, inheritances, and middle class incomes. They far outstrip the rest of the nation in the proportion of taxes derived from non-property sources. In comparison with the rest of the nation they have, with few exceptions, as far as taxation is concerned, "put their fiscal houses in order." [10]

Furthermore, these States compare favorably with the rest of the nation in their effort to support public education, if we measure their effort by the percentage of their potential tax resources spent for education. These 14 states all fall below the national average in tax resources per child, but 13 of them exceed the average national effort to support public education.[11]

In the 14 Southern States there are found nearly 29 per cent of the nation's population, 33 1/3 per cent of the nation's children five to seventeen years old, about 30 per cent of the nation's teachers, and only 16 per cent of the total public revenue available for the public schools of the nation.[12] In these States there are nearly 10,750,000 persons five to seventeen years old of whom about one-fourth are Negroes. In the South 79.3 per cent of the children five to seventeen years old are in school compared with 82.9 per cent in other states, but only 16 per cent of the children enrolled in school are in high school as compared with 24 per cent in other states.[13] In these states is found the most inadequate school property in the nation for the largest number of children. In only four of these states does the average value of public school property per pupil enrolled exceed one-half the average ($255) for the nation as a whole. In only two states outside the South does the value of school property per pupil fall below the value in the highest one of the Southern States.[14]

Of the 1.9 billion dollars made available by appropriations and taxation for public elementary and secondary schools in the United States, only 303 million dollars, or 16 per cent, was available in the 14 Southern States. These states without exception rank below all other states in the expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools, the range being from $27.15 in Arkansas to $63.03 in Florida. Even in the State of Florida the expenditure per pupil was barely 80 per cent of the national average.[15]

The annual salaries paid to teachers in the Southern States are the lowest in the nation, ranging from $504 in Arkansas to $1,091 in West Virginia, as compared with the national average of $1,283.[16]

Perhaps the most distinguishing characteristic of education in the Southern States is the high degree of inequality of educational opportunity within them. It should be added, however, that that is also a characteristic of most of the states outside of the South. Much of these inequalities is directly traceable to a high degree of dependence upon local property taxes levied by each local school district for itself.[17]

With the exception of North Carolina, the typical Southern State derives 50 per cent or more of its public school revenues from local property taxes.[18] Under this system of raising school moneys one community may have railroad and public utility property from which to collect taxes while another adjoining it has only the homes and lands of farmers. In many instances the agricultural lands in one part of the state are fertile and productive, while in other parts, poor and non-productive. The type of educational opportunity offered to many children has been determined by the glaciers of the ice age, when it ought to be determined by the social policy of an enlightened people.[19]

Cities and towns frequently have within their boundaries taxable valuations available only for the benefit of the children who live within their borders, notwithstanding the fact that those values are almost entirely dependent on the surrounding trade territory. Theoretically education is a state function and its support a state responsibility; actually many of the best schools are but little more than glorified private institutions for children of the elect and supported by the exploitation of the rural hinterland.

There are the most insuperable differences between the farm and non-farm areas of the Southern States in their ability to support public schools. The total net income

per child five to seventeen years old is from 3 to 5 times as great in the non-farm as in the farm areas. In fact, for these states as a whole the average income per child in non-farm areas exceeds $2,000 while in the farm areas it is less than $475.[20] There are also great differences among the counties within any state in the number of children in proportion to the adult population. For example, in Alabama the range in ratio of children (7 to 13 years of age) to adults (20 to 64 years of age) is from 235 to 457; in Arkansas from 219 to 433; in Kentucky from less than 200 to over 500. Without exception the highest ratios of children to adults are in the counties having the least financial resources per capita.[21]

III

While the major purpose of this essay is to deal with education on the elementary and secondary school levels, it is significant to point out here that the effort of the people of the South to support higher education is no less significant than their effort to support the common schools. The most recent analysis shows that 7 of the 14 states rank in the upper 50 per cent of the states in the amount of public funds per white inhabitant over 21 years of age devoted to higher education; and only one falls in the lower 25 per cent, the other six falling in the third quartile. In spite of this effort, however, when the total funds, private and public, are taken into consideration, only one of these states ranks above the 50 per cent mark in the amount of funds available per white person of college age, 18 to 21 years, and nine of them rank among the lowest 25 per cent of the states.[22] The superior effort of these states does not put them in a favorable position for two reasons: They have relatively larger numbers of young people of college age, and southern institutions are

to only a small degree the recipients of private benefactions. The total endowments of all colleges and universities in the South are less than the combined endowments of Harvard and Yale.[23] The rich may have accumulated their fortunes by exploiting the natural resources and the labor of the South, but they bestow their largess upon the North.

IV

An important factor in the financing of public education in the Southern States is the maintenance of separate schools for whites and Negroes. This factor is not important as is commonly supposed, although it does result in increasing the cost of public schools. As a matter of fact, separate schools have been one of the chief factors in making it possible to keep down the cost of Negro schools. Certain facts stand out significantly regarding the problems of improving educational opportunities for Negroes.

Negroes have in general the poorest schools to be found in the nation, the poorest trained teachers, the shortest school terms, the poorest buildings, the least equipment and instructional materials, and the most meagre high school facilities.[24]

In spite of this unfavorable status, it is nevertheless true that Negro schools have been rapidly improving. It must be remembered that educational facilities for Negroes started from nearly nothing in 1866. From then to 1930 literacy among Negroes increased from 10 per cent to 90 per cent. Since 1918 remarkable progress has been made in the Negro schools: the average number of days attended per year per pupil has increased from 70 days to 111; the average length of school term, from 106 days to 142; the per cent of school population enrolled in school, from 68.6 to 83.7; the per cent of pupils attending school daily, from

65.7 to 78; the per cent of pupils in high school, from 0.97 to 6.6; and the number of pupils per teacher has decreased from 63 to 43. During this same period the Negro school population increased only 1.5 per cent.[25]

In spite of this progress the Negro leaders complain of discriminations, and discriminations there are of the grossest sort.[26] For example, in one county in eastern Arkansas the expenditures per white pupil are $85 per year and per Negro pupil, $5 per year. For each of the Negro pupils the state paid to that county about $12.50 in state school funds. Thus that county takes for the benefit of white pupils more than half the funds that rightfully belong to the Negro pupils.[27] Examples of this kind of unfairness in at least eleven of the fourteen states are numerous.

The Federal Government has never assumed its just responsibility for creating educational opportunities for Negroes. Negro slavery was permitted under the Constitution of the United States and was abolished by the Thirteenth Amendment. By the Fourteenth Amendment Negroes were made citizens and all legal discrimination on the basis of race made unlawful. But here the Federal Government left the matter. The whole burden of educating the Negro for citizenship was placed on the Southern States, the states whose economic system was utterly ruined and crushed, the states whose white citizens were unable to maintain schools for their own children, much less the Negro children.

Now come the Federal Courts with fresh decisions interpreting the educational rights of Negroes in the light of the Equal Rights (14th) Amendment to the Federal Constitution. Within the last few months the courts have held: (a) That states must maintain facilities in higher education for Negroes of the same kind and equal in merit

to those maintained for white persons.[28] The clear and indisputable conclusion is that this same principle operates for elementary and high schools. (b) A state cannot by law provide for different salaries for white and Negro teachers on the ground of race. Salaries must be uniform according to training experience or other definite qualifications and responsibilities.[29] (c) School boards cannot make contracts with Negro teachers for lower salaries than they pay white teachers except on the basis of different qualifications and responsibilities.[30]

Without question the day of reckoning in the matter of better schools for Negroes has come. One of two things must happen: either money will be diverted from white schools to Negro schools or more money for education must be provided. It will be unfair as well as an economic calamity unless the Federal Government provides the additional funds which will probably, within a few years, amount to at least $133,000,000 annually.[31]

V

No treatment of the status of education in the South would be adequate without considering the fundamental economic conditions of the South that account in a large measure for the small amount of financial support of education. In respect to economic ability as measured by income and wealth per educable child, no one of these 14 states equals the average of the nation. A recently developed index of economic resources of the states according to geographical divisions clearly shows the unfavorable position of the South: Southeast, 40; Southwest, 68; Northwest, 109; Middle States, 113; Northeast, 135; Far West, 156.[32]

In order to determine how much public revenue each of the several states can reasonably be expected to raise, applications of the second model tax plan proposed by the

National Tax Association have recently been made to all the states. The results of these studies show that only one of the 14 Southern States can raise as much revenue per capita as the average for the nation. If these states should adopt the model tax plan and support a standard of education equal to the national average as represented by an expenditure of $58 per year per child, in 8 of them more than 100 per cent of all public revenues would be spent for schools alone, leaving nothing for any other governmental service.[33]

Not only are the economic resources of the South comparatively meagre, but the educational burden as measured by the number of children per 1,000 adults is the highest in the nation. These states, excepting Florida, have 740 persons 5 to 20 years old per 1,000 persons 21 to 65 years old as compared with only 473 for the 12 richest States and an average of only 574 for the nation as a whole. The educational burden of these states is 56 per cent greater than the burden of 12 richest states, but their taxpaying ability is only 25 per cent as great.[34] The farmers of the South have 17 per cent of the nation's school children, but they receive only 3.36 per cent of the total national income. From these southern farm homes comes most of the population that will migrate to other sections where the birthrate is insufficient to maintain a stable population, which condition prevails in all large cities and most of the industrial centers of the North and East where the nation's taxpaying ability is concentrated.[35]

Not only are the economic resources of the South comparatively low and the educational burdens great, but the people of the South in large measure neither own nor control the economic resources of these states. The states constitute the vast colonial hinterland of the great indus-

trial and commercial centers of the North and East. The oil, sulphur, timber, electric power, many of the plantations, and the farm mortgages are not owned and controlled by residents of these states.[36] The extent to which economic power resides outside these states can be appreciated from the fact that about 50 per cent of the corporate wealth of the nation is owned by 200 corporations, the telephone company alone controlling more wealth than the assessed valuation taxable property in 21 states of the nation.[37]

According to the testimony of the tax experts, this outside ownership and control of the resources of the South not only reduces the taxpaying ability of the people but it makes the levying and collection of taxes by the states on some of the greatest potential sources of revenue practically impossible. Corporate devices, the interstate character of business, and the impossibility of collecting personal income taxes from residents of other states, seriously handicap the Southern States in the raising of public revenues.[38]

VI

The South has been labeled "The Nation's Economic Problem No. 1."[39] There are many reasons why it is. The major problem confronting the people of the South and of the nation is how best to solve the situation. One thing is certain: there is no one panacea for the South's ills; there are many correctives for the solution of the complex situation. Among these correctives none is more essential than the education of the people. For example, the situation of the farm tenant in the South is nothing short of desperate. Federal agencies have been established to relieve it. It is quite certain, however, that unless the intellectual level of the farm tenants is raised, there can be no solution.

Data collected by Federal agencies show that the lack of education is one of the chief factors in the dire status of rural families on relief in the South. Note the following report from the Federal Relief Administration: "One-half of the Negro family heads and one-fifth of the whites in the Eastern Cotton Belt reported no schooling, and four-fifths of the Negroes and about one-half of the whites had less than five years. Although the percentage of family heads with no schooling in the Appalachian-Ozark Area was less than for the whites in the Eastern Cotton Belt, the proportion that had completed fewer than five grades was larger."[40] It is clear that the lack of schooling of families on relief is one reason they are so situated. They are the first to be dropped from employment and the last to be employed. "As long as so large a proportion of them lack sufficient education to manage intelligently their own affairs, there will be need of public relief and social case work."[41]

Hoffsommer, in a study of disadvantaged farm families in Alabama, reached the following highly significant conclusion:

> It is not clear at this time just how the disadvantaged are to be got into the advantaged group. But one item is fundamental, and that is that it must be done through the action and initiative of the families concerned. In the final analysis the only part that society can play in aiding them is in making it possible for them to help themselves. It is inconceivable that this can be accomplished so long as they remain in relative ignorance. There are of course many angles to education and to what may be taught. But the common school, imperfect as its present curriculum may be, furnishes the broadest and most inclusive foundation of information leading to the adjustment of individuals in their society. *Before further sums are spent on the various other angles*

for the alleviation of the difficulties of these households, it would seem highly desirable that these children be given a chance, when equipped with equal educational background, to work out their own problems. It is unreasonable to expect that they can do so successfully without this sine qua non of social adjustment in a democracy, equal educational opportunity.[42]

But it is not sufficient merely to have schools available and all of the children attending them. The kind and character of the instructional program is equally as important. The school must be more than an institution for training children in subject-matter that will enable them to climb the educational ladder to higher academic levels. It must be an institution whose program is indigenous to the needs of the pupils and to the community it serves. The broad social and economic goals of education are important, to be sure, but they can be made real only in terms of the situation and needs of the children affected.

The typical rural school, and in all too many cases the typical town and village school, is a dismal institution where "subjects are artificially divided into fragments, which are rehearsed in tiny sections, grade by grade."[43] Teachers are engaged in slavishly trying to follow a state prescribed course of study, in teaching children scholastic tricks.

Pupils need to know the three R's, but it is necessary that they learn them in terms of desirable and useful activities and experiences. They also need to know and practice good health habits including dietary habits; to have an understanding and appreciation of nature; to acquire dexterity and manual skills; to appreciate some of the fine arts and to have some skill in music and art of some form; to acquire habits of social cooperation; to

know what good community life is and what desirable community institutions are.

None of these accomplishments is remotely probable unless the teachers have the ideas and skills necessary to bring them about. The heart and soul of the school program is the teacher. Until the teacher education institutions make it their business to give their students opportunities to see and to participate in school programs that do meet the needs of children and communities, schools will continue to fail in their most important function. The mere training of subject-matter-specialists who know a few tricks of teaching is not sufficient. It is doubtful that the kind of teachers needed can be produced in a two-year period of preparation on the college level. Two years might conceivably equip teachers for elementary schools in cities with a single grade to the teacher and with competent supervision, but not for the rural schools, especially the small ones.

It should also be obvious that the teacher education institution in the South that tries to operate without a strong program in rural education has missed the mark and revealed a total insensitiveness to the needs of the area it has been created to serve.

VII

From the foregoing presentation of facts and conditions the needs of the South in public education are obvious, and will be briefly summarized.

1. The organization of public schools needs to be greatly improved in most of the states. Local units of administration that make possible an equitable distribution of local tax burdens and resources, and the employment of professional leadership for the educational and business affairs of the schools are essential. There is still

need in most of the Southern States for consolidation of schools, especially for high school purposes.

2. The schools will probably not be stronger than their professional leadership. The county superintendents should be selected on the basis of professional qualifications and accomplishments by boards of education and not by popular election. State departments of education should be staffed with professional leaders and freed from the interference of state politics. It may be added here that with a few glaring exceptions the Southern States have a far better record in this respect than a majority of the states.

3. Educational opportunities should be equalized at least up to a modern acceptable standard of scope and efficiency. This can be done only through adequate funds disbursed by the state in such way as to guarantee sufficient funds to local schools to maintain a desirable minimum program. There must be a just and equitable apportionment of funds for the Negro schools. This is not only a moral requirement; it is virtually a legal requirement under the Constitution of the United States.

4. There is no way to have adequate educational facilities in the South without Federal aid for education. The so-called conservatives and states' rights democrats of the South who have traditionally opposed Federal aid for education are the real radicals of the South. It is they who would perpetuate economic conditions that will ultimately produce social and economic revolution and that cannot be removed without education.

5. The instructional program of the schools should be made indigenous to the needs of the children and their communities. The school program should be of such character as to equip the people to meet and solve their personal, social, and economic problems. The traditional stereotyped program of elementary and secondary schools does not do that.

6. The crux of the educational program is the education of teachers. An educational program indigenous to the needs of the South depends upon the purposes and

program of the teacher education institutions. The states should make heavy investments in these institutions, see that they are considered as integral parts of the public school program, and administer them accordingly.

7. In short, there may be many solutions to the problem of advancing the economic and social life of the South, but most of them would be futile without education, the *sine qua non* of progress and prosperity.

FOOTNOTES

1. Charles William Dabney, *Universal Education in the South,* Vol. I. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1936. pp. 3-22.
2. Educational Policies Commission, *Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy.* 1201 16th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., 1939. p. 8.
3. Harold Hoffsommer, "The Disadvantaged Farm Family in Alabama," *Rural Sociology,* Vol. II, No. 4, Dec., 1937. p. 391.
4. The data contained in this discussion relating to the South are for the most part confined to fourteen states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, and Virginia.
5. *Statistics of State School Systems,* 1933-34. Bulletin, 1935, No. 2. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. Derived from Tables 6 and 16.
6. Walter S. Diffenbaugh and Timon Covert, *School Administrative Units.* Pamphlet No. 34. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., Jan., 1933.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Statistics of State School Systems,* 1935-36. Bulletin, 1937, No. 2. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., p. 25.
9. Timon Covert, *State Provisions for Equalizing the Cost of Public Education.* Bulletin, 1936, No. 4. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.
10. Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, 75th Congress, First Session, on S. 419. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. Testimony of Dr. James W. Martin, Commissioner of Revenue for the State of Kentucky. pp. 240-245; also, National Education Association, *Research Bulletin,* Vol. XVII, No. 3, May, 1939, "Tax Legislation Affecting State School Revenue, 1934-39." Washington, D. C.

11. Lyle W. Ashby, "The Effort of the States to Support Education." *Research Bulletin,* Vol. XIV, No. 3, May, 1936. National Educational Association, Washington, D. C. p. 141.
12. *Statistics of State School Systems,* 1935-36. *Op. cit.* Derived from Tables 5a, 13, and 22.
13. *Ibid.,* Derived from Tables 5a, 4, and 6.
14. *Ibid.,* Table 17.
15. *Ibid.,* Derived from Tables 21 and 29.
16. *Ibid.,* Table 13.
17. The Advisory Committee on Education, *Report of the Committee.* Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., 1939. pp. 9-16 and 19-31.
18. Clarence Heer, The Advisory Committee on Education, *Federal Aid and the Tax Problem.* Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., 1939. pp. 41-43.
19. Statement by Dr. Paul R. Mort in an extemporaneous address to Chief State School Officers at Hot Springs, Arkansas, 1932.
20. Newton Edwards, *Equal Educational Opportunity for Youth.* American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1939. p. 173.
21. *Ibid.,* p. 53.
22. Fred J. Kelly and John H. McNeely, *The State and Higher Education.* New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1933. pp. 258 and 263.
23. National Emergency Council, *Report on Economic Conditions of the South.* Washington, D. C., 1938. p. 27.
24. Doxey A. Wilkerson, The Advisory Committee on Education, *Special Problems of Negro Education,* 1939. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.
25. Unpublished data. Research Division, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
26. Hearings before the Committee on Education, House of Representatives, 75th Congress, First Session, on H. R. 5962. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., 1937. pp. 284-95.
27. Arkansas State Board of Education, *Biennial Report,* 1938-40. Little Rock, Arkansas. pp. 94-95.
28. *Missouri, ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada,* 305 U. S. 337, 59 S. Ct. 232, 83 L. Ed. 208.
29. *Mills* v. *Lowndes,* D. C., 26 F. Supp. 792, 801; *Mills* v. *Board of Education of Anne Arundel County,* D. C., 30 F. Supp. 245.

30. *Alston, et al.* v. *School Board of City of Norfolk, et al.,* 112 F. 2d 992.
31. Doxey A. Wilkerson, The Advisory Committee on Education. *Op. cit.,* p. 54.
32. Newton Edwards, *op. cit.,* p. 116; John K. Norton and Margaret Alltucker Norton, *Wealth, Children, and Education.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937. pp. 36-37.
33. Newton Edwards, *op. cit.,* pp. 114-115; also, Lyle W. Ashby, *op. cit.;* Leslie L. Chisholm, *The Economic Ability of the States to Finance Public Schools.* Contributions to Education No. 669. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936. Mabel Newcomer, *An Index of Taxpaying Ability of State and Local Government.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.
34. Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, 75th Congress, First Session, on S. 419. *Op. cit.,* pp. 22-28.
35. Newton Edwards, *op. cit.,* p. 88.
36. Hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, 75th Congress, First Session, on S. 419. *Op. cit.,* pp. 227-233.
37. "How 1776 Has Been Undone," *Journal of the National Education Association,* Jan. 1934. p. 2, quoting from Adolph A. Berle and Gardner C. Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property.* New York: Macmillan, 1933.
38. Hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor, United States Senate, 75th Congress, First Session, on S. 419. *Op. cit.,* pp. 233-238.
39. National Emergency Council. *Op. cit.,* p. 1.
40. P. G. Beck and M. C. Forster, *Six Rural Problem Areas—Relief, Resources, Rehabilitation,* Research Monograph I. Division of Research, Statistics and Finance, Works Progress Administration, 1935, Washington, D. C. pp. 90-92.
41. *Ibid.,* pp. 2-3.
42. Harold Hoffsommer, *op. cit.,* p. 391.
43. Edwin R. Embree, "Education for Rural Life," *Farmers in a Changing World,* 1940 Yearbook of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. p. 1040.

In 1916 W. T. Rowland was graduated with the B.S. degree from Henderson-Brown College. He spent the following thirteen years—except for the interruption for military service—in the Arkansas Public School System. He was teacher and principal at Van Buren (1916-1918) and El Dorado (1918-1922), and later he became superintendent at Searcy (1922-1927) and Marianna (1927-1929). In 1929 he joined the staff of Hendrix as instructor in education and field worker among alumni and Arkansas high schools.

While working in the school system of Arkansas, he was pursuing academic studies at Peabody College (M.A., 1921; Ph.D., 1932). The year that he completed his work for the doctorate, Dr. Rowland accepted a position as research assistant in the Division of Surveys and Field Studies at Peabody. A year later, however, he returned to Arkansas to become professor of psychology at Monticello Agricultural and Mechanical College for the academic year 1933-1934. In 1934 he was made Director of the Division of Research and Information in the State Department of Education. In September of the same year, he resigned to become Director of Research for the Louisville Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky. In 1935 he was appointed to the position which he now holds: Assistant Superintendent of the Louisville Public Schools.

Dr. Rowland's essay, "Living and Learning in the Secondary Schools," is a product of both academic and practical research. It is an educator's view of the problem of education for democracy.

LIVING AND LEARNING IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

W. T. ROWLAND
Assistant Superintendent, Louisville Public Schools
Louisville, Kentucky

WE LIVE in the United States of America, a nation dedicated to the rights of "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," under a government designed to "establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity."

Through the years there has been little departure in national philosophy from these early concepts. It is true that changes in economic ways, especially advancing technology; national and world significances growing out of rapid means of communication and transportation; and restlessness of older civilizations have all contributed to making more complex the means of maintaining social forms through which this philosophy may be applied. But still justice is an ideal; peace and goodwill, conditions to be desired; common defense, a watchword; general welfare a goal; and liberty a personal trust to be merited and guarded as among the most precious heritages which can be transmitted to the generations yet to come.

Upon such a philosophy there has been built within self-imposed limits a civilization characterized by enterprise, by free initiation, by personal expression free from repression, and by search for knowledge free from restriction.

Institutions, or forms of institutional life, have grown up in our social, economic, and political economy for the facilitation and implementation of our philosophy and

our modes. But for the moment let it be assumed that there had been left out any such institution as a school for adolescent youth, and it should later be decided that there should be such a school, so patterned as to be consistent with the ideals and life of our society. Upon its establishment, let us visit this school to see if it fits into the picture.

As we approach the building, flying the American flag, near time for the beginning of the morning session, we may notice schoolboy patrolmen alert to the problems of safety in traffic. As we enter the building we probably will be met by a boy or a girl stationed in the corridor to assist pupils, teachers, parents and other visitors passing in and out of busy halls. We are escorted to the office of the principal, and our wishes being made known, we soon find ourselves, when the day's program is under way, being conducted through the building for a tour of inspection of the educational activities.

Generally speaking, we find classes given over to the study of English, foreign languages, history, government, and mathematics. We find laboratories in which pupils carry on study and experiments in the sciences, studios for expression in fine arts, and shops for learning skills related to home and industry. We find gymnasiums dedicated to physical exercise and education, and clinics devoted to health instruction and habit. We find playgrounds designed for tests in fair individual and team competition and for games requiring not only wholesome competition but socially desirable cooperation. We find, throughout, an emphasis on personal initiative, or personal effort.

We look in on a student assembly, with student leadership and student participation. Here or elsewhere we may learn of student councils for determination of certain policies relating to student life. We may hear discussions that give us insight into some of the extra-class activities having

to do with interests of the school, or into personal interests of certain groups of students; or we may learn of activities projected beyond the school into the life and interests of the community in which adults and youths live together.

Would such a picture as this meet the requirements? If so the American high school is meeting a measure of success. To say that every high school is doing well, all that might be implied by this brief sketch would be an expression of wishful thinking. On the other hand, even the poorer schools meet many of the specifications. The average school meets most of them, and among the best schools all of them are usually found. Certainly it can be said that the high schools are increasingly conscious of their obligations, as they have emerged from the status of institutions designed to give formal instruction to a few to the point of offering a way for the great masses of youth to live consistently with the ideals and applied philosophy of the nation as a whole.

To a person born into the various blessings and opportunities of this country, our liberties, our institutions of government, our economic system and even our opportunities for education are taken for granted. In an average community, little affected by recent foreign infiltration, a person not able to read and write is regarded as a curiosity. Not only is literacy accepted as normal, but the attributes of a general education upon the secondary or high school level are looked for in persons almost as a matter of course.

Like many things which are accepted casually in America, it means little to say that there are annually enrolled in the country's public high schools some 6,000,000 youths. But when it is said that this number represents as many as are so enrolled in comparable schools in the rest of the world, the numbers are significant. Not only

are the numbers significant, but when the origins of the secondary schools in this country are examined, and when their progress is considered, with their aims and functions, it is apparent that the secondary school is and has always been tied up with the very way of our national life. By this is not meant that in the earliest days there was a conscious effort to establish schools reflecting and contributing to the development of a definite way of life. Existence itself was then often primitive, and even precarious. It was in many respects simple. There was little apparent need for formal instruction for the masses, and any advanced education was for the few, reflecting an European attitude, or a reaching for status. But even so, there is little or no distortion in the statement that education even in those beginnings was consistent with the life and ideals of the people.

The history of a definitely organized program of secondary education in America dates from 1635, when the Boston Latin Grammar School was founded. This school, and other Latin grammar schools which flourished in the colonies for more than a century was largely a college preparatory institution, with its curriculum based particularly upon Latin and Greek, except that it was necessary for reading and arithmetic to be offered in as much as it did not, for the most part, draw pupils from the elementary schools, which were designed for a lower economic class. Colonial Massachusetts followed this pattern for early secondary education in its first legislation on the subject, the General Court, in 1647, declaring it is to be a "chief interest of that old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the scriptures," and provided that towns of one hundred householders should "set up a grammar school . . . to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the university."

Since those early days American secondary schools have developed through several forms, and shifting of emphases, but they have continuously and progressively reflected the aims and ideals of the nation; and more recently, with an expanded conception of their functions, they have more nearly exemplified the life and activities of the body politic, both in their offerings and in the manner of their administration. Accordingly, while institutionalized procedures are generally slow to yield to change, it is not surprising, in light of our total philosophy of 1941, to find the objectives of education defined in terms of self-realization, of human relationship, of economic efficiency, and of civic responsibility.

The Latin grammar school was really transplanted from England. Excepting that many ideals of the colonists remained as a part of English heritage, this type of school can hardly be said to have been in keeping with the rapidly liberalizing philosophy of this country. It is not surprising therefore that it eventually gave way to another type of secondary school, the academy, the first of which was established in Philadelphia in 1751. This institution too was rooted in England, but it was more in keeping, for those who would have secondary education as nearly as possible a universal opportunity for youth, with the spirit of America. While study of foreign languages was available it was not required, and more attention was paid to English, mathematics, natural philosophy or science, and the more "practical" subjects. Though usually controlled by corporation trustees, with only a part of their support coming through public funds, the early academies more nearly than the Latin grammar schools met the needs of the people generally. As the academies increased they in some instances supplanted the grammar schools in public support, and became wholly tax supported. While the

academy was designed as a more liberal institution than the grammar school, when it declined in favor of the public high school, many of those which survived became almost wholly college preparatory in nature.

The public high school, as we know it today, and which is the typical secondary school of America (private, including church, schools enroll only about six percent of the total number of secondary school pupils) had its beginnings in Boston, in 1821. In this city public elementary schools had become well established and many parents who did not plan to have their children to enter college desired an extension of educational opportunity for their children through the secondary school, without the expense necessary to send them to an academy. Accordingly there was born this school for the great masses of the people. The school was designated the "English Classical School," (reported three years later as the "English High School") reflecting in name the fact that it was difficult to think in any but older terms. However the curriculum, similar to that of the academy, was based upon the English language, history, natural philosophy, or science, and much mathematics, particularly in its applied forms.

In its beginnings the Latin grammar school made no attempt to articulate with the elementary school. The academy was not designed particularly to fill the middle ground between the elementary school and the college, and the public high school took little or no account of the college. However as time passed the high school gradually took over the functions of both the grammar school and the academy, being designed to equip youth for continued study in college and to offer work of a terminal character. The extent to which the American people have believed in the worth of this, their peculiar institution, is reflected in the fact that while in 1890 less than four percent of boys

and girls from fourteen to seventeen years of age were enrolled in public high schools, 1940 found more than sixty percent so enrolled.

The three types of secondary schools described all had their beginnings in the old, northeast section of the country. By the time the great west was opened the public high school had gained popularity, and, generally speaking, it has been the only secondary school to make its influence greatly felt. Also, in the spirit of the region, it met relatively few obstacles in becoming established. The same, however, cannot be said of the South. The same steps which marked the progress of secondary education in New England are found in the history of the South. The grammar school, with its emphasis on college preparation, never gained as solid a place. Being only for the economically higher classes, centers of population in the rural South were not sufficiently numerous to support many such schools, and so instruction normally offered in the grammar school was, in many instances, placed in the hands of private tutors.

The academy, on the other hand, though developing later in the South than in New England, flourished in all of the southern states until the time of the Civil War. Even after the Civil War, due to lack of public funds, if for no other reason, it was the typical secondary school in wide areas of the South for several decades. The academy was not wholly without support from public funds, but in most instances tuition was charged. The religious motive has been significant throughout the history of the South. This motive has served the entire region well in the field of education. In the absence of popular support of secondary education, and even elementary education, direct charities, endowments, and church sponsorship did much

to maintain and popularize schools. Through such forces, and particularly the church, the academy was made available to thousands of youths, their enrollment before the Civil War running to about 200,000.

Most of the early southern academies are gone. Indeed, the movement was practically at a standstill by 1850, as the public high school was beginning to make its influence felt. During the period after the war, when the public high school movement was retarded, it continued, in many places, as the only secondary school. Many of these academies, even the later ones, grew into colleges. For instances, every private college, and some of the public, in the state of Arkansas had its genesis in an academy, or had an academy as a part of its organization. In fact, in more than one of these institutions there was a time when the educational offering extended from the first grade through senior college. In one town, Arkadelphia, in this state there were, through the latter years of the last century and the early years of the present century, two church-related academy-colleges for white students, and two church-related academies for colored students.

The two academies for colored youth in Arkadelphia, Arkansas, were typical of the many secondary schools founded for colored students in the South. Prior to the Civil War, with the Negroes in slavery, public education was not for them. Even though after the war the new state governments provided for public education, efforts to provide public high schools were meager, and for colored students practically non-existent for years. In fact while all of the statistics cannot be regarded as wholly reliable, it appears that in the school year 1890-91 there were enrolled in public high schools in the former slave states only about 400 Negro students, as compared with approximately 8,000 white students. The academies (some bore

the names of colleges, universities, seminaries, and the like, but it is probable that the work was on the secondary level) for Negroes in the same states in the same year enrolled about 5,000 students. They were largely supported by the Northern philanthropy.

Not only did the academy provide many Negro youths practically their only opportunity for secondary education during the last century, and well into the present century, but it adopted a pattern which has since found its way into the entire American public school system in the form of industrial and vocational education.

With the rise of the public high school as the dominant secondary school of America a school more nearly characteristic of the true philosophy of the country was firmly established. The Latin grammar school and the academy came into being as a result of a demand for widespread educational opportunities for youth, and even though there was a belief in the value of education, it was only natural that in the establishment of the schools old patterns were followed, and there had to be time for ideas for new means of support and for curriculum change to catch up with a philosophy pointing to universality of opportunity, and for a new psychology to suggest that the formal curriculum might not accomplish desired aims.

The concept of the grammar school declined as a popular secondary school largely for the reason that it was not wholly tax-supported, and their main purpose was to prepare boys for college. The decline of the academy likewise may be accounted for on the basis that the academies depended for support mainly from private sources, and despite their being formed somewhat as a protest to the narrow academic curriculum of the college, in many instances they themselves came under the domination of

the college. On the other hand, they did exert some liberalizing influence on the colleges. They also articulated with the elementary schools, and provided an excellent forerunner for the high school. Incidentally it should be noted that the academy, unlike the grammar school, admitted girls, usually in separate institutions. However, since the girls were not expected to go to college, their academies became largely "finishing" schools. It is interesting to note that in some of the older cities in the East and South, public secondary education followed this traditional plan of segregation of the sexes when the public high schools were established.

It might appear that the logical way for a program of education to grow in a country new in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, before the idea of universal education had gained acceptance anywhere, would be from the bottom up, or from the elementary school to the college. The contrary, however, was true in this country, in that colleges and universities appeared first, secondary schools next, to supply students for the colleges, and then elementary schools, in order that those to occupy lower stations in life might at least learn to read and write. And, while the public high school was not designed as a college preparatory institution, with the decline of the grammar school and the academy it did take over this function. Among the reasons for this was that a college education has always been an ideal in this country, and as publicly supported colleges began to come into existence, college preparation appeared to be a normal function of the public high school. So finally America found a secondary school which is truly representative of a philosophy which had for a long time, if slowly, been in the developing, a school founded on the elementary school, offering extended educational opportunities through a curriculum peculiar unto

itself, and at the same time serving as a training ground for those who would pursue higher scholastic attainments. And, while the high school was for a long time much dominated by the college, and to an extent it still is, it in turn has influenced the college, and what is more important has found in itself a function of interpreting the ideals of this country to its youth, and of equipping youth better to serve those ideals.

In the South the public high school, particularly after the formation of the Southern Association in 1895, probably came to be dominated by the college, and college entrance requirements, more than in any section of the country. In more recent years, with the rapid growth of the high school, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has concerned itself more than formerly with the education of youth not planning to enter college. Also there has been questioning as to whether the pursuit of certain traditional courses, particularly mathematics and foreign languages, necessarily constitutes the best college preparation for all students who might attend college. Therefore, in 1936 thirty-three high schools from throughout the Association's territory were selected for an experiment and given much freedom, not only in departing from traditional subject fields, but also in a more informal, and what was believed by the participating schools, to be a more functional manner.

As a result of this study up to 1940, its proponents found improvement in the teaching of subject-matter, growing out of emphases being placed on student experiences, and a more direct attack on such desirable outcomes as critical thinking, group cooperation, independence in study, and mastery of essentials. Also improvement in administrative procedures, relating more to improvement in instruction, and less to mechanics of organization and

control were effected. Also claimed were more effective teacher-pupil relationships, following naturally in situations in which students and teachers share responsibilities for what is studied, and as they determine methods of study and solution of a pupil's own problems; and finally more satisfying teacher-pupil-parent relationships were developed, as the schools became an integral part of the life of the community.

Such departures as have been undertaken by the thirty-three high schools in the Southern Association study demanded a different approach on the part of teachers, and consequently special summer programs for teachers in these high schools were set up in various colleges of the Southern Association. Therefore there is a somewhat reversed picture in this situation in that the program of the high school may have a more significant influence upon the program of the college, and of the institutions for the education of teachers.

The Cooperative Study of the Southern Association is only one indication of a fairly well defined trend in secondary education over the country as a whole, where it is found that there is increasing emphasis on relating the work of the school more closely to life outside of school, and indeed of recognizing that the years spent in school are themselves an important part of life for its own sake, and that these years should have in them much the same values and problems as life outside the school, and that these two lives should be lived in much the same way; or rather that there should be natural continuity.

It would be expected that any state in setting up a program of education would naturally pattern it to produce a person educated in terms of the philosophy of that state. This would be true of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy,

or Communistic Russia, as well as in a democracy. Indeed, in a dictatorial society it might be expected that a state's program of education would be defined more specifically in terms of the particular form that the government might take.

In our country it is found that while the religious motive was dominant in colonial programs of education, the national, or political motive was of relatively minor significance. There are found in colonial legislation establishing schools declarations that learning would prove "profitable to the Commonwealth," or that "good education of children is of singular behalf and benefit to any Commonwealth," but such statements seem formal, as the programs of education were formal. Furthermore, there was emphasis on the desirability of education as it would react to the benefit of the individual, there being some implication that social good would be an eventual outcome.

Even in the constitution of the United States no reference was made to education. Furthermore only one-half of the constitutions of the first sixteen states making up the Union made reference to education. Massachusetts, in its constitution of 1780, laid the duty of cherishing the interests of literature and the sciences upon the legislature, "wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue, diffused generally among the people" being declared "necessary for the preservation of . . . rights and liberties" of the people. Likewise the New Hampshire constitution of 1784 would preserve a "free government (through) knowledge and learning generally diffused."

Examination of the early courses of study reveals that much confidence in attaining certain lofty ends was placed in formal learning seemingly for its own sake, but the important principle of freedom to learn has always had

its champions, and the ideal has even expanded with greater application. In fact, beyond the ideal of freedom to learn there has lately been placed more of an emphasis on the necessity to learn, and to be taught in terms of our particular society. Thus there have been resurrected many of the early concepts of "rights," of "liberties," of "freedom" of "general welfare" and the like, augmented by apparently more emphasis upon what is connoted in such words as "obligation," and "duties."

In preserving the thread of a broadening fabric of national, of democratic philosophy it would appear to be necessary that instruction modify its method from that of forced learning of forms to that of leading youth into analysis of values, and of mastery of personal, social, and economic skills necessary to the preservation of our government by representative democracy, and of our economic system built up by individual enterprise and cooperative effort.

A survey of current school practices reveals the adjustments that our high schools are making in their efforts to preserve and strengthen our national life. The high schools have for years taught the subject of government, the subject of democracy. There have been evidences in citizenship practices that the teachings have in many instances been of little significance. Consequently ten years or more ago there began to appear on a wide front a movement of liberalization, which in many instances resulted in the discarding of many old practices, many with much good in them, and the substituting of practices, which, though well intentioned, in the hands of uncertain teachers and aimless students, caused much fear that the schools were merely floundering. However, this very condition brought with it a challenge for intensive study and effort and it is believed that some lessons have been learned in the field of directing

desirable student purposes toward ends attained through earnest effort applied within the meanings of freedom of effort, pursuit of opportunity, shouldering of responsibility, and discharge of obligation for the sake of the values inherent in these concepts, and the ends to be attained. In other words, while lessons must still be learned through hard work, there is more widespread effort to make of the high school a real laboratory for students to learn the ways of democracy while pursuing knowledges and skills necessary to effective adolescent and adult life.

With the opening of schools for the 1940 session the one word on the lips of people in the United States was "defense." What should the schools' part be? No doubt in many instances programs were developed emphasizing much pageantry and exhibitions of patriotic zeal, all of which is good. On the other hand, in many schools all over the land there were quiet, earnest conferences in which teachers and administrators spent hours in many sessions in efforts to clarify the meaning of democracy to the schools, and in what ways the schools' program might be strengthened permanently as an instrument of our society to contribute to its stability and purposes. Such conferences, it is believed, resulted in a great wave of rededication on the part of teachers to the ideals always inherent in the philosophy underlying our schools, and of a search for more effective means of making the program of education really function in the lives of boys and girls in our schools.

Of course in high schools all over the land there were apparent the efforts being exerted for physical defense, as the schools were made the centers for programs of defense training of workers needed in a new kind of possible war, whose prosecution would depend on mechanical effectiveness. In the summer of 1940 it was decided that the

millions of dollars appropriated by the national Congress for defense training should be extended through the regular channels set up for vocational education in the high schools. Soon school facilities normally given over to day instruction in peace time pursuits found themselves taken over in mid-afternoon for use in the grim business of training for technical skills necessary for possible war. As the school year progressed in many instances only the morning hours saw the schools transformed again into institutions to receive as usual the boys and girls, coming to school in much the way of usual years. But even in their coming, and settling themselves into the day's routine, there was something of a new spirit of earnestness in applying themselves to old tasks. Into the schools there had come a stronger zeal for individual effort, for actual achievement through difficult tasks rendered meaningful.

If nothing else of good should come from the travail of the early years of the decade beginning in 1940, it should be found that the American high school attempted to seize the opportunity to try to interpret democracy to youth, and to make it effective in their lives. The American high school believes in democracy. It believes that democracy can work. It refutes the claim made by some that it is ineffective in a crisis. It believes that it must be understood, and that it must be taught as something more than a theory to youth, but that it must be practiced by administrators, by teachers and by pupils in the schools, using the same formulas that would be applied in corollary ways of life outside of school. The American high school does not regard democracy as something to be sought by the weak as a means of survival in a competitive world, but as a means of making the weak strong. The high school would keep alive the pioneer spirit of this country, and make life romantic, one of discovery, one of purpose, one

that toughens fibres through demand for effort and achievement in order that values may come to the individual, and to the society of which he is a part.

In a country such as ours every institution is rightfully under scrutiny and criticism of the citizens who support the institution. The high school is constantly under such scrutiny, and often subject to such criticism. Alert watchfulness inspired by the desire to safeguard the school, and honest criticism based on knowledge of what the schools are doing and are attempting to do are ever welcome. Only through such a public attitude may the schools contribute their share in our adventure in democracy, and only through the success of the adventure can our nation survive.

CRAWFORD GREENE and TIM MOORE STINNETT are co-workers in the Arkansas State Department of Education. Mr. Greene is Director of the Division of Information and Research; Mr. Stinnett is Assistant Commissioner of Education and Director of Teacher Education and Certification.

Both are graduates of Henderson-Brown. Mr. Greene received the A.B. and B.S. degrees in 1921 from Henderson-Brown; then in 1927 he received the M.A. degree from Peabody. Since that time he has attended summer sessions at Wisconsin University and Arkansas University. He has served in the state school system of Arkansas since 1921. From 1933 to 1939 he was treasurer of the Arkansas Education Association; from 1935 to 1940 he was a member of the Arkansas Library Commission; and since 1935 he has edited the Arkansas Journal of Education. In 1934 he was appointed to the position which he now holds in the State Department of Education.

Mr. Stinnett is a member of the 1922 graduation class of Henderson-Brown. He now holds, in addition to the B.A., a M.S. degree from the University of Arkansas. For fourteen years he was Superintendent of Schools at Stamps, Arkansas. In 1937 he became a member of the staff of the State Department of Education of Arkansas.

Mr. Stinnett and Mr. Greene have collaborated before. Together with Mr. E. B. Wesley they wrote *Workbook in the Problems of American Democracy*. The article which follows is an evaluation by the co-authors of the present status of education in Arkansas. It is an evaluation with an eye toward the future.

ARKANSAS EDUCATION LOOKS AHEAD

CRAWFORD GREENE
Director of the Division of Information and Research
AND
TIM MOORE STINNETT
Assistant Commissioner of Education, and
Director of Teacher Education and Certification

IN A VOLUME of addresses which he prophetically entitled *No Friendly Voice,*[1] President Robert Maynard Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, published one address the theme of which he took from a line in one of Milton's poems, "The sheep look up and are not fed."

In allegorical language it is to be supposed that President Hutchins is voicing a rather universal lament. The sheep, of course, are the children. The feeders are those engaged directly in the field of education, public and private, and the food ostensibly is the educational fare which these persons have been serving.

That there is something lamentably wrong with our educational scheme, or, perhaps we should say, that there is something inadequate about it, is not to be denied. With a universal system of free public education in America; with an annual school bill of some two and a half billion dollars; with a total public school enrollment of 25,975,108 under the direction of 918,715 teachers; with a zeal for schooling on the part of the parents for their children unprecedented in modern history, and almost a fanatical faith on the part of parents and children in the educative process as a sort of magic open sesame to all that is worthwhile in life, it is quite obvious that the system of feeding has not lived up to expectations.

While President Hutchins' point seems to be that the failure is a result of the discarding of what was once accepted as the eternal verities of education—that is to say, the classics—the writers could not agree to this diagnosis as an explanation of why the "sheep" continue to "look up and are not fed." The answer is not so simple as that. If it were, then all we would need to achieve the promise, once permeating universal education, would be to return to the classics. The answer rather is a complex one, involving both the availability and the adequacy of education.

Public education, both in Arkansas and the Nation, has gone through a well defined period of evolutionary development from the concept of whom was to be educated and the concept of what constituted education. It seems strange to us today to read of Thomas Jefferson's idea that three years of elementary education was sufficient for the average person. Yet at that time the Nation was young; by and large it was rural; people lived in comparative isolation; the problems of adjustment were relatively few and relatively simple. Hence, both in point of time and in content, education was limited.

It is presumed that President Hutchins' lament was not directed at any particular section of the Nation. As a matter of fact, he was, apparently, indicting the whole process as it exists in America. If this correctly interprets this distinguished educator's views, then it can be said that the expenditure of money alone cannot of itself make of the educational program of any state or region, or indeed any nation, the perfect thing we all seem to expect. That is to say, the educational shortcomings of the South and particularly of Arkansas, which have traditionally been viewed as the consequence of adverse economic factors, are only in part so. But since such a viewpoint has been

almost universally accepted, no discussion of the subject could seem to avoid this phase.

The report of the President's National Emergency Council on Economic Conditions of the South, which added one more "Turkey in the Straw"—"Slow Train Through Arkansas"—"Arkansas Traveller" flavor to the distorted concept the Nation has of this great region, puts its figurative finger upon many so-called significant and [sic] alarming factors but neglected to review some basic facts. Among these are the following:

1. The Civil War and subsequent constitutional amendments created a class of citizens, now grown to approximately twelve million, who were starting from scratch educationally, economically, and socially, and who were thus an added burden to a bankrupt and disorganized society. In other words, a problem which the Nation created was left to the individual states of a region to solve.

2. Reconstruction legislation has as its intent—and effectively accomplished the act—to make of this region a colonial empire of the industrial North and East.

3. The South's recovery and rehabilitation has been, in many respects, phenomenal.

Too long has the South indulged in the expensive and stultifying practice of commiseration. We like to explain away our inequalities, our lagging educational system, and our pressing economic conditions by a crying jag of self-pity. How we love to mouth such examples as the following:

"In the rural regions of the South, particularly, there is a marked disparity between the number of children to be educated and the means for educating them. For example, in 1930, the rural inhabitants of the Southeast had to care for 4,250,000 children of school age of the country's

total [of 31,500,000], although they received an income of only about 2 per cent of the Nation's total. In the nonfarm population of the Northeast, on the other hand, there were 8,500,000 children in a group that received 42 per cent of the total national income—21 times as much income available to only twice as many children." [2]

Then we usually follow this statement with a clincher about as follows:

"But the poor educational status of the South is not a result of lack of effort to support schools. The South collects in total taxes about half as much per person as the Nation as a whole." [3]

There is, of course, a veritable mountain of evidence that the Southern child has not had, and in view of existing economic discriminations—discriminations which have been given legal sanction and support by the Federal Government—will not have access to an educational opportunity equal to the child in other areas of the United States.

There is, too, the indisputable fact that a dual system was created by acts of the Federal Government—a system which cannot help but make the educational problem of this region more complex and more expensive than that of other regions. It can serve no useful purpose to deplore existing concepts which sustain that system or to denounce the provincialism of the South; the problem is here—rightly or wrongly—and is destined to stay; and the fact remains that this has created an additional burden not borne by other regions—a burden created by all the people without assumption of responsibility for its effective solution.

All of this evidence, while serving as a "face saver" for Chambers of Commerce and other publicity conscious

agencies and individuals, is quite beside the point. *The point is that education itself is the solution.* The very process which is judged as being deplorably deficient in Arkansas and throughout the South must become the medium through which it is itself lifted to a level of adequacy. These inequalities would not have been tolerated by this great region with all of their discriminations and injustices had the people been sufficiently enlightened concerning them. This statement applies with particular force to our own people. The truth of the matter is that we have been ignorant of our own conditions and the causes of them—again, a product of our educational deficiency. When we can become enlightened enough, we shall become vocal enough and powerful enough to force a reconstruction of these policies, which since the Civil War have lain as a dead weight upon the corporate body of the South. The great danger is that, now being aware of these discriminations, we shall wait to be rescued by the gradual unfolding of an awakening social conscience throughout the Nation. Social conscience is a thing that unfolds with exasperating slowness; and if we make the mistake of folding our hands and waiting for salvation of this sort, the result will be as disastrous as has been that relating to our policy of industrial development. In this latter respect, we have literally begged for the industrial North to exploit our national resources and we have been willing, even eager, to content ourselves with the few crumbs of low wages that fell from the table of the industrialists in exchange for our unmatched bounties of nature. The solution to that problem is closely analogous to that of the problem of education. It is not capital from the North and East, as such. The solution is the application of the brains, energy, and initiative within the South to the utilization of its own natural wealth.

The answer is to be found in the educational process which we deplore so much. *What we do with what we have will determine tomorrow what we have to do with thereafter.*

The tragic shortcoming of public education in the United States, and this applies with peculiar emphasis to Arkansas and the South, lies in the fact that it is a transplanted thing, an academic thing, a process divorced from the realities and needs of every day living. In short, a process that is not indigenous to the resources, to the problems of human living.

A Program of Education for Arkansas

Thus, for Arkansas, there are two correlative phases which have been emphasized and re-emphasized time without number—phases which must be to some extent forgot and discarded. We must forget the past in at least two important respects:

1. We must cease to excuse the deficiencies by laying the blame elsewhere.

2. We must break away from traditionalism in our educational objectives and procedures.

The first has been discussed at some length. The second is of indispensable importance. Whatever the direction of education in Arkansas is to be in the future, there is one thing certain—it cannot be education about the past.[4]

"There is only one subject matter for education, and that is life in all of its manifestations. Instead of this single unity, we offer children: Algebra, from which nothing follows; Geometry, from which nothing follows; Science, from which nothing follows; History, from which nothing follows; a couple of languages, never mastered; and lastly,

most dreary of all, Literature, represented by plays of Shakespeare, with philological notes and short analysis of plot and character to be in substance committed to memory. Can such a list be said to represent life, as it is known in the midst of the living of it? The best that can be said of it is, that it is a rapid table of contents which a Deity might run over in his mind while he was thinking of creating a world, and had not yet determined how to put it together. . . ."—Alfred N. Whitehead.[5]

In trying to determine all-inclusive, yet obtainable goals for public education in Arkansas, the staff of the State Department of Education some time ago set up an eight point program, which it felt to be based upon the immediate needs of the state and within the ability of its people to provide. That program [6] is stated as follows:

> A desirable goal for public education in Arkansas is to provide an adequate educational opportunity for every individual from the time he enters school until he is ready to take his place in adult society. In terms of this goal it is the function of the public school system to provide a general, suitable, and efficient program for all children. Such a program should include the following:
>
> 1. Twelve grades of public school available to every child.
> 2. A minimum annual term of eight months.
> 3. Every child housed in a building that is located in a healthful environment, built for school purposes, free from fire hazards, comfortably heated, adequately ventilated, kept in a sanitary condition, equipped with modern school furniture, and properly supplied with library and library materials.
> 4. The provision of transportation for those children who live more than a reasonable walking distance from school.

5. A school program in which the curriculum and all extra-curricular activities are adapted to the needs of the individual children and are so directed as to enable the individuals to develop into the best of which they are capable.
6. Instruction directed by professionally trained teachers who are paid sufficient salaries to attract and hold good teachers and to enable them to work with a feeling of economic security both for the present and for their old age.
7. The organization of administrative school units sufficiently large to enable each unit to provide for its children a complete educational program which will include such desirable features as supervision of instruction, efficient business administration, and comprehensive health and guidance programs. Within each administrative unit attendance areas should be developed so as to provide for schools of a desirable minimum size as close to the homes of the pupils as density of population and geographic conditions will permit.
8. Development of a financial system that will insure the provision of the above outlined program, with state funds available to provide a reasonable minimum program for each administrative unit.

In proceeding to a discussion of the unfolding of this program for Arkansas children, it will serve a valid purpose to present a picture of the progress made up to the present time.

In the beginning of its public school system Arkansas placed the local responsibility for schools in the township, to which plan it adhered until after the Civil War.[7] Following the adoption of the Constitution of 1874 the present district system was developed as small communities demanded local autonomy for their schools. Between 1874 and 1912 the number of school districts increased from

approximately 1,500 to 5,143, remaining over 5,000 until 1920.

The first decade of the twentieth century marked the beginning of high school development in Arkansas. Coincident with the increase in high schools came a definite decrease in the number of school districts. Thereafter the consolidation movement accelerated the development of high schools. In 1909-10, there were 76 classified schools which reported an enrollment of 5,684 and graduated 300 yearly. There was a steady growth in classified high schools until in 1939-40 the 525 classified white high schools enrolled 58,769 pupils and graduated 12,251 pupils. During this period the number of school districts was reduced to 2,920.

Between 1912 and 1940 the yearly expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance increased from $13 to $29 per child, reaching a peak of $36 in 1931. During this same period the average length of school term rose from 116 to 159 days and the average salary of teachers increased from $301 to $584. The peak year for teachers' salaries was 1931 when the average was $730. The per cent of pupil school enrollment in classified high schools was 1.43 per cent in 1910 as compared with 12.4 per cent in 1940. In 1939-40, 15.6 per cent of the public school enrollment was in the upper four grades.

The growth of high schools in the past thirty years has been unexcelled in public school history. The peak in Arkansas has not yet been reached simply because high schools are not yet available to all children in the state. In 1938-39, 32 per cent of the white children and 63 per cent of the Negro children enumerated resided in districts which did not offer twelve years of schooling. It has been shown conclusively that if high school facilities are provided for the children of Arkansas, they will attend high

school. Of the 2,920 districts in the state approximately eight hundred offer high school facilities for their children. Between 1928 and 1940 when the number of districts decreased from 4,594 to 2,920 enrollment in grades 9-12 increased from 38,639 to 73,768 despite a decrease in total enrollment.

One of the reasons for increased growth in recent years has been the existence of the school equalizing fund which has been of particular assistance to the consolidated school in providing funds for operation, debt service, and transportation. Without this assistance, undoubtedly many of these schools would have been seriously handicapped and would not have been able to show continued growth in high school attendance.

The foregoing gives a fair summary of the extent to which this program has been realized up to the present. What of the future?

There are at least four areas to which attention must be directed in the years ahead. They are:

1. The reorganization of administrative units so that a full 12 year program can be available to all of Arkansas' children.

2. Adequate financial support.

3. The direction of the program must be reorganized so as to be based upon the needs of Arkansas' children.

4. Teaching must be professionalized.

1. Reorganization of Administrative Units

According to the Constitution of Arkansas it is the function of the State to provide a general, suitable, and efficient school system wherein gratuitous instruction is provided for all children.

In the Joint Report of the Committees on Attendance Areas and Administrative Units of a conference called by the Commissioner of Education in Washington on June 17, 18, and 19, 1935, are found the following statements:[8]

"It is the function of the public school to provide an adequate educational opportunity for every child from the time he enters school until he is ready to take his place in adult society.

"An administrative unit should be sufficiently large to warrant the provision of all essential and desirable administrative and supervisory services except those provided by the state."

Howard Dawson, who has made an intensive study of administrative units in order to determine the size of satisfactory units, recommends[9] an organization of approximately 10,000 to 12,000 pupils as being able to provide the varied program and services desired in a school system. Such a system would involve a population of around 50,000 persons. Because of the difficulty of securing 10,000 or more pupils in rural areas, Dr. Dawson considered the possible modifications in the number of persons needed to perform the necessary administrative and supervisory services by doubling up their fields of service. Under a modified plan the minimum desirable size of an administrative unit is one that has from 1,600 to 1,750 pupils and some 46 to 50 teaching positions. From his studies Dr. Dawson concludes that only those governmental units such as townships, counties, and cities having 7,500 or more population are sufficiently large to be considered as administrative units for school purposes.

Arkansas recently collaborated with the United States Office of Education in an intensive study of local school units. This study revealed the disparities between local

units in the State, showing clearly the difficulties involved in developing an acceptable minimum school program for all the children of the State as is proposed by the Constitution. For example,[10] 1,817 districts in the State had areas of ten square miles or less, with the areas of 602 districts ranging from only two to five square miles and ten having an area of less than two square miles. The smallest district comprised only 160 acres. A total of 297,771 of the State's 646,881 enumerates in 1935 resided in districts in which the assessed valuation was less than $500 per enumerate. Only one teacher was employed in 1,625 districts. There were 2,749 one-teacher schools, enrolling 21.8 per cent of the pupils. A total of 2,484 districts enrolled less than 100 pupils and only 73 enrolled as many as 1,000.

By counties the number of school districts now ranges from three to 125. It is in the counties with the largest number of districts that the most meager school facilities are usually found.

Numerous studies have been made showing the need of large units if adequate school programs are to be provided on an economical basis. The practicability of the creation of such units has been shown time and again by the comparison of services and costs of schools prior to and after consolidation. Unit costs are usually found to be less in the consolidated schools, yet the improved program usually results in increased attendance, increased holding power, and a demand for better facilities, more efficiently trained teachers, and longer terms of school. The usual result is, as some one has said, that the increased cost of education has resulted from the cost of increased education.

The Study of Local Units in Arkansas [11] pointed out the impossibility of the State living up to the mandate of its Constitution under the small district system. It pro-

posed reorganization of the State into either 280 administrative units, each to include one or more high school centers, or into 75 units rather closely related to the 75 counties of the State, as a means of placing a desirable program within the reach of all children, the efficiency and effectiveness to be governed by the amount of school revenues available.

Unfortunately numerous factors serve as obstacles to reorganization of school units. These factors range from the reluctance of local school directors to relinquish their posts to fear on part of the central urban districts of having to "level down" their programs if they are to unite in a cooperative program with their less wealthy neighbors, all of which points to the need of the people as a whole for a broader vision of what a State program really means and of the factors involved in developing such a program.

2. Adequate Financial Support

"There was a time when many citizens felt that it was not right to use public funds to educate other people's children. American citizens today have come a long way from that position and are willing, for the most part, to support governmental expenditures for elementary and secondary education for all of the children of the nation. These expenditures vary from community to community not merely in terms of the resources available but quite as certainly in relation to the idealism of the adult population." [12]

The willingness of Arkansas people to support their schools has been shown by successive changes of the millage limit for local school purposes from five to seven to twelve to eighteen mills, by the increase of the State millage for school purposes from two to three mills, and by the addition in recent years of numerous special taxes.

When the layman looks at the record of these increases in taxes, he is likely to speculate upon the efficiency of the school system and may be prone to criticize the educators for their constant pleas for more funds. When he does so he fails to consider certain fundamental factors, such as:

1. The drop in assessed valuation of property in the State from $624,000,000 in 1929 to a low of $410,000,000 in 1936, with an increase to only $436,000,000 in 1939.

2. The tendency for special taxes to "dry up" or fluctuate greatly, or a rather prevailing tendency for such taxes to be shifted or diverted to other purposes by succeeding legislatures.

3. The enormous expansion in the educational program with costs mounting greatly as terms are increased, as pupils stay in school longer, as better housing facilities and equipment are provided, as better trained teachers are employed, as transportation needs increase (already a million dollar item in the school budget), and as allowances have to be made for changes in the decreased purchasing power of the dollar.

4. The difficulties of providing a constantly improved program under a financial program characterized by constitutional limitations and earmarked revenues.

5. An attempt by State school officials to help provide reasonably acceptable facilities in the poorer districts. The range in wealth per child enrolled varies from $21 to $9,474 per child by districts, from $240 to $1,736 per child by counties, with ranges within counties such as $83 to $4,833, and $21 to $2,225.

Between 1934 and 1940 the State increased its contributions to local school districts from $2,000,000 to $5,400,000 in addition to providing approximately $1,000,000 more for various public school purposes including pur-

chase of free textbooks, matching teachers' retirement contributions, providing facilities for blind and deaf children, and providing for State and county school administration.

Unfortunately while the State has been increasing its support for the schools, local support declined from $9,900,000 in 1931 to $7,300,000 in 1940. This decrease, coupled with the expanding secondary school program, has caused financial as well as growing pains in the body politic of the school system. The increased State support has been a life saver to the poorer districts.

Of the State funds approximately eighty per cent are distributed upon a uniform basis while about twenty per cent are distributed from the State Equalizing Fund on a limited budget deficit plan which provides $18 per child in attendance for all operating costs except transportation for which $12 per child is provided.

The need for increased equalizing funds is shown by the disparities between aided districts and non-aided districts for 1939-40. Aided districts had 37 per cent of the State's average daily attendance but only 32 per cent of the expenditures for current operation. They transported 72 per cent of the children transported for which they reported only 55 per cent of transportation expenditures. The average current expenditure per child in attendance was $25.30 as against $31.10 for non-aided districts. The current expenditure per child in attendance for transportation was $9.25 in aided districts and $14.28 in non-aided districts.

The expanding needs of the schools, coupled with decreased local support and an extremely limited State Equalizing Fund provide the State with a difficult problem. Inextricably linked with this problem is that of the small district system of operation. If large districts are to be created additional funds are needed. But the resources

of the districts are so limited that when additional funds are provided they are generally used to improve the local program rather than to extend it.

Complicating factors are the obvious tendency to shift support of governmental agencies from the property tax which makes increased State taxes necessary and the inevitable corollary to this situation—the constant demands of numerous worthwhile agencies for increasing shares of the State tax dollar.

Arkansas has been generous to its schools in the matter of financial support. Undoubtedly some increases are still possible but if its children are to have educational facilities on a par with the average of the Nation, the State, after making the supreme effort, must look elsewhere for assistance. In the meantime, however, it faces such problems as the following, to some of which it is already giving its attention:

1. Creation of larger administrative units to provide for economical administration and to eliminate wasteful and costly small schools.

2. Development of a State program designed to provide a minimum acceptable program for every child.

3. Improvement of the effectiveness of the present local and State programs of tax collection.

4. Directing the school program in such channels as to enable the products of the schools to improve their economic status, thus in turn increasing the wealth and income of the State.

3. An Indigenous School Program for Arkansas

In attacking the problem of achieving an idigenous program of instruction for Arkansas schools, a five year curriculum revision program was terminated in 1938 by

the State Department of Education. This "Cooperative Program to Improve Instruction" enlisted the participation of public school administrators and teachers, college faculties, parent-teacher groups, and laymen generally. The recommendations of this study were drastic and far reaching.[13] The philosophy underlying the program of instruction recommended was as follows:

> Education is for a society which is rapidly changing rather than static. It should not only bring the individual into adjustment to his environment, but it should also increase his adaptability so that he may be able to make new adjustments constantly. Thus, education should serve the function of orientation by giving organization and direction to educational experience with specific reference to effective participation in the essential relationships of life—personal, socio-civic, and the like. The function of education, then, is not only to conserve social values but also to point the way to more desirable modes of living.

It is in brief a program built around the assumption that there are certain well defined and persistent life problems about which the activities of adults tend to cluster. These problems are persistent ones in the sense that they recur in each generation. The form may change but the basic problem is the same. Education, therefore, should revolve about these problems. The function of education as a process is to give the child a functional knowledge of and a degree of mastery over these problems which, whatever the environment in which he comes ultimately to live, whatever the circumstances of this living, he must all the days of his life encounter and, in a measure, solve if his adjustment to life is to be satisfactory.

In this scheme of instruction subject matter is more or less without intrinsic value. Knowledge for knowledge's sake is discarded for (what to some will appear) utilitarian

purposes. In other words, factual material is a means to an end—not the end itself.

Such instruction, then, centers about the concept of giving children mastery of the following persistent life problems:[14]

1. Protection and conservation of life, property, and natural resources.
2. Production and consumption of goods and services and distribution of the returns of production.
3. Communication and transportation of goods and people.
4. Recreation.
5. Expression of aesthetic impulses.
6. Expression of religious impulses.
7. Education.

The effectiveness of Arkansas' school program in the future will be dependent upon the effectiveness with which instruction can be developed around these problems and the effectiveness with which children are given the techniques for gaining an understanding of them.

It would be exaggerated optimism to suppose that so radical a departure from traditionalism can be achieved over night. The fact is that it cannot be. It is rather an evolutionary process—a slow one; one demanding patience and effort and hard work. Hence, such a program offers a challenge for the future. It is the basis upon which Arkansas' educational program is to be changed from subject mastery to problem mastery. In short, the program by which Arkansas' educational program is to be transformed from the academic and abstract to an indigenous one.

A school ought not to exist in a community without vitally affecting for the better every phase of that com-

munity life. Yet how often has the opposite been true. Schools have existed in communities where there was poverty; where there was ill health, poor housing, poor landscaping, little or no recreation, limited cultural factors—and have contributed too little to the improvement of these vital areas in human living. The measure of the effectiveness of an educational system is to be found not so much in the amount of money per child which it costs but to a large degree in the change it has made in the living of all the people whom it is supposed to serve.

Arkansas looks ahead to the type of community school that is concerned with and contributes to the improvement of the life of that community—not in terms of some vague and distant future but in the terms of *here and now*. Education has all too frequently emulated some churches in this respect. That is to say, it has concentrated upon the creation of some mystical Utopia hereafter, when the crying need has been for a better, more livable *here and now*. To the extent that the schools continue to fix their figurative gaze upon tomorrow (to the exclusion of consideration of the pressing realities of today) to that extent they will continue to be ineffective—yes futile—institutions.

The school must be a place of fitting boys and girls to improve their economic conditions wherever they are *now*.

It must be a place where their health is made better *now*, and where they are equipped with the knowledge and desire and the means to keep it better tomorrow. It must be a place where beauty is—in reality and substance not in theory. To this end it must fix the "design for living" and must work aggressively for the unfolding of that pattern in the community. If the school cannot do these things in the community it serves, of what good is it? Is it worth the pitiably little, relatively, which we now pay for it?

The emphasis upon this function detracts in no particular from the inculcation of certain basic concepts and attitudes which are ageless and continuing. All of life cannot be reduced to utilitarian terms, of course; the recognition that some of its phases are, however, is essential to an effective program.

4. Professionalization of Teaching

Despite the undoubted importance of the foregoing as essential factors in Arkansas' unfolding program of public education, the ultimate effectiveness of these factors will depend upon yet another factor. This factor is the quality of the teaching personnel. This statement is axiomatic and will be accepted as such by laymen and school people alike.

While there has been a growing consciousness of this fact on the part of the general public, the evidence is rather conclusive that this feeling has not reached a compelling point as yet.

The data in Table I will illustrate the point.

TABLE I.

Number of Teachers Employed According to Training, 1939-40 [15]

	NUMBER OF TEACHERS						
	White			Negro			
Years of Training	Elem.	H. S.	All	Elem.	H. S.	All	Totals
No High School	38		38	2		2	40
1 Year High School	43		43	3		3	46
2 Year High School	68		68	38		38	106
3 Year High School	68		68	61		61	129
4 Year High School	1,169	15	1,184	322	5	327	1,511
Less than 1 Yr. College	227	7	234	56		56	290
1 Year College	1,387	50	1,437	408	14	422	1,859
2 Year College	2,242	360	2,602	565	47	612	3,214
3 Year College	844	338	1,182	183	45	228	1,410
4 Year College	878	2,004	2,882	259	264	523	3,405
5 Year College	58	339	397	3	16	19	416
6 Year College	13	119	132	2	2	4	136
Not Reported	369	159	528	333	29	362	890
Totals	7,404	3,391	10,795	2,235	422	2,657	13,452

This table reveals that 2,322 teachers, or roughly 15 per cent of the total, have had less than one year of college preparation, while approximately 65 per cent have completed two years or more of college work. Thus, 35 per cent of the teachers have had preparation of less than two years college work.

The median preparation of white teachers in Arkansas is 2.4 college years, while that of Negro teachers is 2.39 for the year 1939-40.[16] This median preparation will compare favorably with that of the Nation as a whole. This fact simply confirms the statement that the public has not yet given the consideration to measures which would tend to professionalize the status of teaching as is necessary.

Not only is this fact reflected in the preparation of teachers. More impressive evidence is to be found in the annual turnover of teacher personnel. That is the number leaving a given occupation for other endeavor as an index of the stability or instability of that occupation. In Arkansas 20 per cent of all teachers have had less than 5 years of experience.[17]

Arkansas has taken definite steps designed to accelerate the trend toward making of teaching a stable and satisfactory profession—a profession surrounded with such safeguards as will attract and retain personnel of unquestioned competence and vision.

There are several factors to be considered that tend to make of any vocation a profession in the accepted sense. These might be enumerated as follows:

1. Adequate and pertinent preparation as regards formal schooling.
2. Reasonable tenure provision.
3. Reasonable security.
4. Opportunity for in-service professional growth.

With reference to the preparation of teachers for Arkansas schools, the program now in operation is conceived on the basis both of up-grading rapidly that preparation and at the same time of making reasonably certain that such preparation shall be a funcational one.

The State Board of Education in 1939 adopted a pattern for teacher education and certification of teachers [18] which substantially is that agreed upon throughout the Southern area as best meeting the needs of this region.

Briefly, this program is predicated upon completion of the baccalaureate degree with provision for broad general education, adequate specialization, and integration of professional training. The institutions approved by the State Board of Education for the preparation of teachers have all launched comprehensive development programs within the respective colleges to meet these requirements.

In addition, the 1941 General Assembly through Act 329 gave a broad grant of power to the State Board of Education with reference to the certification of teachers. This Act confers upon the State Board full authority for determining qualifications for entrance into teaching.

Recent enactments, too, have tended to guarantee reasonable economic security for teachers. A teacher retirement system is now in operation, providing means by which the declining years of teachers may be spent in dignity without the haunting fear of want. This not only has tended—and will continue to do so in the future—to make teaching as a profession more attractive, but has further added to the general efficiency of instruction by making it possible for teachers who have passed the age of usefulness to retire and make way for younger, more efficient personnel. The operation of this system has already proved its value to the general public.

Another step in the direction of providing reasonable security for teachers is the Arkansas Teachers Salary Law enacted by the 1941 General Assembly.[19] This Act increases the economic security of the profession in several ways.

1. It earmarks definite percentages of the total school revenues to be used for teachers' salaries.

2. It attempts to guarantee that districts shall be able to pay certain minimum salaries specified in the Act on the basis of preparation.

3. It contains a continuing contract clause which is a step toward tenure procedures.

In order to stimulate continuing growth professionally, the General Assembly [20] has made available all teachers' license fees, after the maintenance of the Certification Division has been provided for, to be used in defraying the cost of further college for teachers.

Summary

To summarize, Arkansas education looks ahead to a program of public education which contemplates at least a high school education made available to every child; to a program which will be adequate to the economic, social, and cultural needs of respective communities; to an indigenous program of education; to a program with adequate financial support and carried on by persons whose preparation is such as to equip them to discharge with vision and imagination the terrific responsibilities of mental, moral, and spiritual leadership—persons to whom teaching constitutes, by virtue of professional standards, security, and social viewpoint, the most attractive profession on earth.

Whether or not a readjustment of economic and educational discrimination is to eventuate in the future, Arkansas is determined that it shall strike the shackles from the feet and the scales from the eyes of its people by utilizing what it has for the benefit of all of its people *here and now.*

References

1. Robert Maynard Hutchins, *No Friendly Voice.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. p. 115.
2. National Emergency Council, *Report on Economic Conditions of the South.* Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1938. pp. 25-26.
3. *Ibid.* p. 27.
4. David Y. Thomas, *Liberal Arts Education in the South.* Conway, Arkansas: Hendrix College Bulletin, Vol. 25, Nov., 1938.
   (Basic Factors in Planning for the South.) pp. 9-16.
5. Educational Policies Commission, *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy.* Washington: National Education Association, 1938. p. 39.
6. *A Public School Program for Arkansas,* unpublished material of the staff of the State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas.
7. Arkansas State Department of Education, *Study of Local School Units in Arkansas.* Little Rock, 1937. pp. 10-16.
8. Katherine M. Cook, *Reorganization of School Units.* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1938. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1935, No. 15. pp. 12-17.
9. *Ibid.* 9-10.
10. *Ibid.* 25, 42, 43, 95.
11. Arkansas State Department of Education, *Study of Local School Units in Arkansas. Op. cit.* p. 208.
12. Educational Policies Commission, *The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy.* Washington: National Education Association, 1938. p. 47.
13. Arkansas State Department of Education, *A Tentative Course of Study for Arkansas Schools, Elementary Section,* Bulletin V, Little Rock, 1936. p. 8.
14. *Ibid.* p. 43.
15. Arkansas State Board of Education, *Biennial Report 1938-40.* Little Rock, 1940. p. 104.
16. *Ibid.* 52.
17. *Ibid.* 104.
18. Arkansas State Department of Education, *Regulations Governing the Certification of Teachers in Arkansas.* Little Rock, 1939. p. 10, *et seq.*
19. Act 319 of the Acts of the Fifty-third General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, 1941. q. v.
20. Act 240 of the Acts of the Fifty-third General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, 1941. q. v.

HENDERSON, TODAY AND YESTERDAY

The Story of the First Fifty Years

WILLIAM RITCHIE
Head of the Department of History
Henderson State Teachers College

HENDERSON STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE is the heir to the property, the traditions, and the spirit of an institution which first opened its doors to students in September, 1890. This institution has had a unique past, for it is one of the few modern teachers colleges which trace their origins to the splendid denominational institutions of other days. If we take into consideration the church school which preceded it on the home campus, Henderson State Teachers College is the oldest of the State colleges of Arkansas, with the exception of the University at Fayetteville.

Since its founding, the college has operated continuously, under four names in succession. From 1890 to 1904 it was called the Arkadelphia Methodist College. In the latter year the name of the school was changed to Henderson College in honor of Captain C. C. Henderson who had given the school substantial and steady support. In 1911 the trustees of the college voted unanimously to insert the name Brown in the title of the college to make it read, Henderson-Brown College. Like Captain Henderson, Mr. W. W. Brown had made generous contributions of money, property, and time to the school. The institution continued to bear the name of Henderson-Brown College until 1929 at which time the Methodist Church of Arkansas withdrew support from the school. It was then taken over by the State of Arkansas and dedicated to the function

of teacher training, and then rechristened Henderson State Teachers College.

Since it became a State institution in March, 1929, the physical plant of Henderson has expanded from four buildings to the present seventeen, and from an enrollment of 205 to approximately 1,000, including the summer school. The work of the college has been standardized and fully accredited. In 1931 it was admitted to the American Association of Teachers Colleges with a rating of A and, in 1934, to the North Central Association as a liberal arts institution devoted to the education of teachers.

* * *

As early as 1886 the Methodist citizens of the town of Arkadelphia felt the need of an institution of higher learning in their home town. They invited the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Little Rock Conference, to meet in Arkadelphia April 17 of that year. At that meeting a committee of citizens of the town proposed to the Board of Education that "The citizens of Arkadelphia tender to the Board of Education of the Little Rock Conference . . . a building worth $30,000 and sufficient land as a site, upon condition that they establish and maintain a conference co-educational college at that place, and the control of said college to be vested in a board of trustees named by said Board of Education."

The offer was accepted by the Board of Education, but it was necessary that it be approved by action of the Little Rock Annual Conference. Approval was granted in 1889.[1]

The conference appointed the following men to serve as the first board of trustees of the new college: J. McLaughlin, R. H. Featherstone, R. W. Huie, E. H. McDaniel, C. V. Murry, C. H. Cargile, J. R. Dale, H. A. Butler, W. R.

White, J. R. Harvey, H. D. McKennon, J. H. Gold, H. R. Moore, C. E. McSwain, and A. O. Evans. These trustees filed articles of incorporation with the Secretary of State. The proposed institution was incorporated for the purpose of Christian education in literature, science, and art for both sexes. A building committee was appointed consisting of R. D. Hearne, C. V. Murry, R. H. Featherstone, E. H. McDaniel, J. McLaughlin, J. W. Patterson, and M. Trotter. In accepting the campus buildings and other equipment of the Arkansas Methodist College the conference resolved "that we will take the Arkansas Methodist College under our care and pledge to it our support as a conference co-educational college under the condition above mentioned." The name Arkadelphia Methodist College was agreed upon.[2]

About the time these plans were in the making, the Methodist conference decided to relocate Hendrix College, an institution which, since about 1885, had been operating at Altus, Arkansas, under the sponsorship of the Methodist Church.

Some of those interested in the new college decided that it would be a better idea to have Hendrix moved to Arkadelphia if possible. They accordingly made an effort to bring about the transfer of Hendrix to Arkadelphia, instead of erecting the new college which was then under consideration.

The *Southern Standard* in its editorial columns discussed the movement over a period of weeks, especially in the issues of March 14, 21, and 28. It argued that the established good will of Hendrix would be an asset which a new college would not have and that to the Arkadelphians, therefore, Hendrix would be more desirable than the proposed new institution. To the Methodists of the

State, the healthful location, the "temperance and good moral atmosphere" prevailing in the town, were held up as special inducements to locate Hendrix in Arkadelphia. A large and enthusiastic meeting was held in the Methodist Church on Monday night, March 21, 1890. Dr. J. R. Harvey delivered a splendid speech showing the great advantages which would be to Arkadelphia if the college were located here. The following committee was appointed to go to Little Rock to work for the location of the college at this place:

"Dr. John McLaughlin, chairman; Dr. J. R. Dale, Dr. J. R. McDaniel, Professor J. W. Conger, Professor J. B. Dunn, S. R. McNutt, R. T. Cook, F. J. Carpenter, Adam Clark, J. H. Crawford, F. J. Miles, L. E. Gibney, A. M. Crow, E. H. McDaniel, R. H. Featherstone, Capt. John Smoker, Mayor L. J. Weber, E. M. Hall, W. J. Frost, Judge R. D. Hearn, B. Thomas, G. W. Carder, T. F. Anderson, J. S. Barkman, E. J. Kelley, Jack Slaymaker, J. E. Bradley, E. B. Kinsworthy, W. M. Power, E. E. Ree, C. E. McDonald, R. T. Parks, W. E. Barkmen, J. A. Husband, and J. A. Holmes." [3] This committee did not succeed in its mission and Hendrix was established at Conway.

After the failure to secure Hendrix for their city the citizens of Arkadelphia resumed their original plan and determined to build a college that would be a credit not only to the city, but to the State as well. Captain R. W. Huie called a meeting at the Methodist Church, and stimulating and enthusiastic addresses were made by Dr. McLaughlin, Rev. J. R. Moore, and S. R. McNutt. Committees were appointed to raise funds and to speed up the work on the new college. The work had been temporarily halted while the question of relocating Hendrix was still unsettled. Now that this matter was settled, Arkadelphia proceeded energetically with the original plans. "Our citi-

zens are enterprising and know no such word as fail. Let every one taking an interest in this give all they are able, and when built it will greatly enhance the growth and prosperity of the place," said the *Southern Standard,* March 28, 1890.

The building committee rushed the construction of the plant as rapidly as possible under the direction of Pat Powers, the contractor. School opened September 3, 1890, with an enrollment of 110, thirty of whom were boarding students.[4]

The course of study is indicated by the list of the faculty with their titles: G. C. Jones, President, and Professor of Science and Mathematics (M.A., Vanderbilt); Rev. Boone Keeton, A.M., Ancient and Modern Languages; J. H. Sledd, Languages and Natural Sciences; Miss Fannie Cook, English and History; Miss Lizzie McKinnon, Preparatory Department; Miss Tessie Moore, Vocalization; Miss Irene Ice, Elocution and Calisthenics; Miss Lizzie Cannon, Art Department; Miss Ruth Johnson, Shorthand and Typewriting; and W. Estes, Penmanship.[5]

As it was organized at that time, the College provided educational training at every level from the beginning through the awarding of the college degree. Degrees offered in the first catalog were: Ph.B.—English Course; M.E.L. —Mistress of English Literature; B.S.—Scientific Course; B.A.—Classical Course; M.A.—Latin, Greek, and two modern languages.

By the act of enrolling in the Arkadelphia Methodist College, the student pledged to abide by the following rules among many others:

To wear a uniform to prevent extravagance.

To attend Sunday School and church every Sunday morning.

To attend no sociable, ball, party, or public gathering during school or study hours.

Not to give or receive attention from the opposite sex, either by visits or correspondence.

To use no tobacco, snuff, profane or obscene language about the college.[6]

The school in the first catalog proposed to ministers that "for every five pupils sent to the college, one will be taken free." That proposition sheds light on the size of the Methodist preachers' families of that day.

Among the duties of teachers were the following: To be present at prayers, to attend the daily opening and closing of school, to be present in the recitation room in advance of class, and to subscribe for at least one journal or magazine in the line of work belonging to their departments and furnish this publication to the reading room. Lady teachers might receive company from seven to ten p. m., Fridays and Saturdays.[7]

The growth of the school enrollment was healthy. In 1892, there were 150 students, 75 of whom were from a distance. It is interesting, also, to note that the last wing of the original building was added in 1892 to accommodate the growing needs of the school.

Up to December of the year 1904, the enrollment was 171 of whom 62 were in the academic department, the remainder being in the collegiate and special departments. The course of study had been revised according to the plans authorized by the General Board of Education of the Methodist Church. Only two degrees were then conferred by the college and these degrees were Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science. No institution in the State had a higher standard of requirements for these degrees than Henderson College.[8]

In the early days of the school a good deal of emphasis was placed on dramatics, debating, and oratory. These activities were receiving emphasis in all colleges in Arkansas during this period. Annual State oratorical contests and debates were held, and special trains were chartered to carry the student bodies of the colleges to such contests. Bands, uniforms, flags, instruments for making noise, cheering sections, and other forms of fanfare were then used to support the debaters, orators, and dramatists, much in the same manner as such fanfare is today used to create a background for athletics. The orators must have been silver-tongued spell binders if one may literally believe what the papers of the time said about them. A typical contest was held in Little Rock, May 1st, 1898. Concerning that event the *Arkansas Gazette* said in part:

"More than 2,000 people crowded into the theater to hear the orations. The Fayetteville and Arkadelphia College bands discoursed inspiring music in the open air before the assembling of the spectators. Inside the theater there was enthusiasm unbounded. The various college yells resounded and the college colors were waved. Strong-lunged collegians did the yelling and pretty 'sweet-girl graduates' of the near future waved ribbons.

"Mr. O. A. Graves, representing the Arkadelphia Methodist College, was introduced and as he advanced to the footlights the A. M. C. yell rose. Mr. Graves' subject was 'In Change Unchanged.' He made himself distinctly heard by the vast audience. His voice was strong, but not harsh; his gestures frequent, but not malapropos. At one juncture his admirers burst unceremoniously into applause. His theme led him into patriotic flights delivered with the heartfelt earnestness of true oratory. His ardent appeal for Cuban liberty and reparation for the Maine's destruction stirred his auditors and made them forget for the

nonce that they were not in the halls of Congress listening to orators like Thurston and Foraker. His allusion to the 'crown of thorns and cross of gold' evoked hearty cheers for Wm. J. Bryan. When Mr. Graves concluded he was the recipient of a floral tribute and his partisans shouted themselves hoarse." [9]

The commencements and recitals, too, of the early decades must have been particularly artistic. A write-up of a recital of September 30, 1898, said: "On Monday night, September 26, the Arkadelphia Methodist College threw open its doors to the public for the first recital of the scholastic year. Even the night seemed to be aware of an unusual treat in store; the queen of the evening had climbed Heaven's highway; and scattered her silvery drops of mellow light until all nature seemed painted by fairy fingers to the expectant crowd. . . . Miss Smith, the instructor in voice, simply entranced the waiting crowd, with music sweet as the chimes of silvery bells, she sang one of the sweetest selections ever heard in the city. Her voice was angelic and the enraptured auditors gave vent to their appreciation by a vociferous encore." [10]

Military subjects and drill were introduced into the curriculum in 1906 and remained in the courses until the end of the administration of President Hinemon.[11] A course in photography was offered in 1904 by Professor Thompson. It must have had little patronage since it was offered for that year only.[12] The curriculum was at all times made to conform to "the requirements of the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and the organization of the teaching staff was in conformity to the rules of the same body. In 1913 the college and academy faculties were separated,[13] and by the year 1926 the academy had been gradually discontinued.

From the first, the college gave its attention to the matter of physical health. Baseball, basketball, calisthenics, and drill were in vogue from the very beginning. By 1908 football had become the major athletic interest and it gradually overshadowed all other college sports. Then as now however there were those who opposed it. Their sentiment on the question is interesting:

"Whereas, inter-collegiate football is bringing much censure upon the church, and it is increasingly difficult to prevent the athletic ideal from overshadowing the church's aim in education, and

"Whereas, inter-collegiate athletics make heavy financial demands upon its supporters and is encouraged as an advertisement of Christian education, and is a disintegrating rather than a constructive force in our education work, and

"Whereas, much that is contrary to Christian ethics is chargeable to these inter-collegiate contests, such as profanity, gambling, Sabbath desecration, and acrimonious rivalry, therefore,

"Be It Resolved, that we recommend that the Trustees of the colleges under our control abolish inter-collegiate football from our policy and practice." [14] Resolutions notwithstanding, football continued to be the major college sport, as it is today.

While the growth of the college enrollment was gratifying, the finances had not prospered. The report of 1892 indicates that it had cost a good deal to get equipment for the new college building: "The financial condition is as follows: Cost and value of buildings and grounds, $38,750; cost of furniture, $4,000; philosophical, scientific, and chemical apparatus, $200; fixtures, $2,000; unpaid subscription, $5,000; two blocks in the city of Arkadelphia,

$1,000; total, $52,750; indebtedness, $23,500." That was a considerable deficit for one year. Because of the difficulties so early involved in financing the school, the Board of Trustees leased the college to President Jones for $10,000, and for a time the institution was carried on as a kind of semi-private venture. For this reason in 1894 the Little Rock Conference discontinued its financial support of the "Arkadelphia Methodist College." [15] Later, after the restoration to full title and possession of the school, the Conference again gave its financial backing.[16]

Professor G. C. Jones continued to personally operate the college until 1898 at which time the Reverend Cadesman Pope was chosen president for a term of two years. In reality Jones subleased the college to Reverend Pope because, Jones said, he desired a rest for himself and family; but he seems nevertheless, to have acted as Professor of Science and Mathematics during these years. He also was the permanent background of authority at the college.[17]

For several years an effort had been made to release the college from the private control of Professor Jones. The minutes of the Conference approved such a movement as early as 1898, and dedication services were even held celebrating the return of the college to the Conference in 1902. The matter was not completed however until 1904. During the month of May of that year, the Board of Trustees made an arrangement with Dr. George C. Jones and Professor J. E. Wooten, who had been admitted to partnership in the operation of the college, by which the Board secured the entire control of the property for the period of two years with an option for the complete purchase of the lease at a stipulated price at any time during the next two years.[18]

The friends of the school had managed to liquidate the indebtedness referred to above. Captain C. C. Henderson

gave more than $10,000; the citizens of Arkadelphia gave $5,000; and Professor G. C. Jones, the lessee, is reported to have given nearly $20,000.[19]

It was in connection with the repossession of the College by the church that the name was changed from Arkadelphia Methodist College to Henderson College. Captain C. C. Henderson took such a large part in the accomplishment of the affair that the Trustees honored him by giving his name to the College. Captain Henderson protested and insisted that if a change should be made, the name of W. W. Brown be used equally with his own.[20]

By 1909 the College was facing another financial crisis. The report of President Hinemon for that year struck a familiar financial note. While it is not possible to give all such reports in full, for there were many, one may be given as typical.

"The one thing that hinders the progress and threatens the very life of the institution is the lack of money. The school has had little assistance from any source except direct revenue from board and tuition. If we are to continue, this policy must be abandoned.

"The total income for the present year from the opening in September to the present time is $27,768.99. We began September 5th with an over-check of $2,336.75. Our over-check today is $2,164.20. We have bills receivable to the amount of $4,422.46. Our outstanding indebtedness is approximately $4,000. We have in addition, in notes $2,555.90, and open accounts $2,983.75. Of course we will lose a good percentage of the last named amount.

"Thus it will appear that if we could collect all bills due us on the current year we will still have a deficit of a little more than $2,000. It is true that a considerable amount of our expenditure for the current year are not

justly chargeable as a regular item." In the years immediately following this report Mr. W. W. Brown, as well as many others, greatly befriended the school, and as stated above, was honored by having his name associated with that of Captain Henderson in the title of the College.

Part of Key Hall was constructed in 1907 and there was continuous talk of a boys' dormitory up until 1914. During the month of February of that year a destructive fire burned the main building; and since that time, 1914 has been known as the "year of the fire." Of the time immediately following the calamity, the President said: "It was hard on the faculty, hard on the President, and upon the whole organization of the college; but the crisis was survived and the difficulties overcome. Only one day was lost from recitations. We were in a new kitchen and dining halls in one week; in the new administration building in eight days; in the new auditorium in one month." [21]

That sounds like magic, but of course the new buildings were temporary structures made of ship lap. To replace the main building was a more serious and time-consuming matter.

The College faced a major crisis. The insurance on the old building only paid the debts of the institution.[22] There was little money with which to begin a new building, but there was tremendous good will existing in favor of the school. With this encouragement the trustees, president, and friends of the College put on a vigorous campaign for funds to rebuild. Mr. R. W. Huie and Winston Wilson were sent out to raise money for the College.[23] When subscriptions amounting to $56,801 had been secured, the President of the College was authorized to let the contract for a new building costing $80,000.[24] The work was only half done when construction stopped because pledges had

not been redeemed with promptness. The contractor, Mr. A. O. Campbell, offered to finance half of the remaining work provided Captain R. W. Huie and his associates among the trustees would underwrite the other half. The proposition of the contractor was accepted, and what is now the Administration Building of the College became a reality. The new building had necessitated many sacrifices. The students themselves, though the number was small, contributed $1,000.[25]

In the meantime Dr. Crowell had, almost wholly by his own efforts, pushed through the construction of the dining hall and kitchen to be opened at the same time as the new main building. This dining hall has been remodeled and is now serving the College as a library building.

The construction of the new building and the purchase of the necessary equipment had forced the school into serious indebtedness, and it became urgent that serious efforts be made to lift the liens or mortgages and other debts of the school.

The Arkansas *Methodist* of July 13, 1916, featured a coming campaign to raise money to pay off the debts of Henderson-Brown. Churches throughout Southwest Arkansas were urged to give, on an average, $1.00 per member to the College and no pledge was to be binding until the whole sum proposed was subscribed. This publicity was intensified by Dr. A. O. Evans, financial agent for the school, and Dr. Stonewall Anderson who was Educational Secretary of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The campaign of 1916 went only part of the way toward liquidating the debt. Dr. Evans died in 1917 and Dr. J. M. Workman, who had become President in 1915, carried on the campaign. With the help of Reverend Congdon of Benton the president raised $38,000, but that was still

short of the necessary amount. It was necessary to raise one hundred ten thousand dollars more in order to put the College in good standing according to the report of Dr. Workman. When the President, in 1917, "made his report to the annual Conference, Rev. T. D. Scott, . . . made a statement of the increased enrollment and the need of saving the College. Mr. Robert W. Huie, Jr., stated from a legal standpoint what had to be done to save the College." He was applauded and persuaded to accept the responsibility of conducting a campaign to raise the necessary money. "Mr. Huie arranged with his law partner for an absence of ninety days from his office. He then enlisted the aid of Rev. Congdon." In brief, the result of the campaign was that more than four thousand individuals subscribed a total of $125,000 between January 31 and April 1, 1918. Up to 1923 one hundred twenty thousand of the subscriptions had been collected.[26]

The Methodist Church of Arkansas began as early as 1907 to feel the strain of financing its three colleges, and efforts were begun at that date to work out some scheme of unification. In the minutes of the Henderson Board, April 23, 1907, there was adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved: That the President be requested to issue a call for a meeting of the full board to convene on Tuesday, April 29th, 1907, to hear the representatives of Hendrix and Galloway Boards on the proposition to unify all the educational interests under the control of the M. E. Church South in this State."

Little Rock Conference of the Methodist Church in 1908 recommended that Hendrix College be co-educational in the Junior and Senior year and that Henderson become a junior college correlated with Hendrix. The enrollment of Henderson at that time was 333; that of Hendrix was

243. The value of Henderson property was $100,000; that of Hendrix was $79,000.[27]

The friends of Henderson thought that the school would profit by becoming the joint property of both Arkansas Conferences since to do so would give it the whole State over in which to seek support, and a movement to bring this about was consummated in 1919. Henderson therefore became the property of the two conferences, and the Charter was accordingly amended in 1921. The Methodist colleges of Arkansas were then placed under the control of a single board and unity of control was established. From time to time there were suggestions of consolidating the three weak Methodist institutions into one strong one. This, of course, caused uneasiness among the friends of all the colleges. A committee of the conferences had reported in 1926 that it was unwise for the Methodists to attempt to maintain three senior colleges and recommended as a solution that all three of the existing schools be made junior colleges, and one central senior institution be developed at Little Rock. A second committee had reported a year later that the Methodist Church of Arkansas could not maintain three senior colleges and recommended that the resources of Henderson and Hendrix be consolidated and located at either Arkadelphia or Conway. The Conferences met in a special joint session February 28, 1928, and after a debate lasting throughout the day approved the latter conclusion but suggested the feasibility of differentiating the functions of Henderson and Hendrix. Dr. B. Warren Brown, an expert in college surveys, concurred with this recommendation.

On October 21, 1928, the executive board of the three colleges met in Little Rock and voted to advise the Conference that Henderson-Brown and Hendrix should be consolidated. The inspector representing the North Central

Association had reported that Henderson-Brown could not hope to be approved as an A grade college except on the basis of securing a minimum endowment of $300,000.

November 14, 1928, the Little Rock Conference definitely approved consolidation of Hendrix and Henderson but did not decide the question of location. And so the question of location stimulated a rivalry between Arkadelphia and Conway, each contending for the College. In the midst of the struggle the men's dormitory of Henderson burned down. That reduced the physical property of Henderson-Brown in comparison with Hendrix. The upshot of the controversy was that the new College named Hendrix-Henderson was established in Conway and the Henderson trusees adopted the following resolution March 12, 1929:

"We, the Board of Trustees of Henderson-Brown College, hereby accept and approve the act of the Unified Board."

In the meantime a group of Arkadelphia citizens petitioned the Legislature of Arkansas to accept from the city the Henderson plant and to operate it as a teachers' college. The offer was accepted in the words of the preamble, and the school was named Henderson State Teachers College.

"Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of Arkadelphia, Clark County, Arkansas, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are willing that the State of Arkansas take over all the real estate, buildings, equipment, laboratories and accessories, library furnishings owned by said Church and Chamber of Commerce, situated at Arkadelphia, Arkansas, and now being valued at $350,000, to be donated to the State free of liens, and encumbrances, and to be accepted, maintained and supported by the State as a standard Teachers' College of the same class and standard as

the State Teachers College at Conway." [28] The act also provided for a board of four who along with the governor would act as a committee to receive the school; it set up a board of trustees to permanently manage the school, the board consisting of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Auditor, the State Treasurer, and four other competent persons to be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The appointive members of the Board of Trustees were to serve four years each. The terms of two members expired each biennium. The act defined the powers of the Board, provided that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction should be ex-officio chairman, regulated the pay of the members, defined a quorum, set for the qualifications of the pupils, placed upon the State Treasurer the duty of keeping the funds of the school, limited the amount of the budget to the State appropriation, provided for the fees to be paid by students, prescribed the diplomas, excluded the Fine Arts department from sharing in the State appropriation, and required the Board of Trustees to make a biennial report to the legislature.[29]

The legislature of 1941 passed an act placing the financial support of the College on a millage basis. This forward-looking step pleased the friends of the school because it put Henderson on an equivalent financial basis with all of the other State-supported colleges, thus assuring the College a permanent place in the higher education system of Arkansas. Another act of 1941 reorganized the Board of Trustees by removing all ex-officio members and provided that a board of seven members should be appointed by the Governor to guide the destinies of Henderson. The support of the Governor and State legislature in 1941 was most gratifying, and, because of this, the year will stand out significantly in the history of Henderson.

It has been said that Henderson has one of the most beautiful campuses in the State. The land is slightly rolling, and the many oak and pine trees form a shaded park of great natural beauty. The landscaping has been planned to complement the native attractiveness of the background. None of the rustic charm of the place has been lost in the winding walks and well-planned drives which traverse the campus.

The seventeen buildings which comprise the plant at present are grouped in a pleasing and functional design about the campus. The five structures designed for administrative and instructional purposes include College Hall (1914), which contains the offices of the College and a large auditorium; McElhannon Science Hall (1939), which contains faculty offices, laboratories, and recitation rooms; Key Hall (1907), which houses the studios and practice rooms of the Fine Arts Department, as well as the book store, the office of student publications, and meeting rooms for campus organizations; Huie Library (1934), which contains more than 30,000 books, periodicals, and newspapers; and Proctor Hall (1938), which houses the offices and rooms used by the R. O. T. C. Corps, a nursery school, and a number of recitation rooms.

Women students on the campus may live in Mary Sue Mooney Hall (1933), a building providing for 76 students, or in Womack Hall (1936), which houses 124 women. Womack Hall has one floor given over to apartments for those who wish to do their own cooking. Men students may find residence in the Men's Dormitory which accommodates 88 persons, and contains an infirmary and apartments for the Dean of Men and a House Mother. The stadium on the athletic field provides living quarters for 36 men. The general college dining hall is housed on the

lower floor of Mooney Hall. Facilities are available here for more than 300 persons.

The athletic activities of the College center in Haygood Gymnasium (1934). This structure contains a swimming pool, a basketball court, modern dressing rooms, and offices for the athletics directors. The Field House (1937) stands on the corner of Haygood Field. It was completed in 1937, and provides rooms for storage of athletic equipment, and shower and dressing rooms for local and visiting teams. The Haygood stadium was dedicated in 1937, and provides seats for more than 4,000 persons. Other buildings include the new residence for the president (1936), the central heating plant (1936), and the recreation hut which was completed in 1938.

The Semi-Centennial of Henderson fell within the school year 1939-1940 and the College attempted a modest observance of the occasion. A committee was appointed to have general charge of the observance, and a series of programs and events was planned in which every division of the school participated. The first of the series was a colorful dedication of a new science building named in honor of the late Fletcher McElhannon who had served for many years on the Henderson Board and who was the author of the act which created Henderson. Dr. Harrison Hale, head of the Department of Chemistry, University of Arkansas, addressed a large audience on the subject "The Fruits of Science." This opening program was sponsored by the Division of Science of the College and was featured by the first academic procession in the history of Henderson. The Physical Education department made its contribution in the form of an upset gridiron victory over the sister Teachers' College at Conway, and the Masquers, the college dramatic society, produced a skillfully executed drama in honor of the school's jubilee.

Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, addressed the students and friends of Henderson on February 24 on the subject, "Our Emerging Democracy." More than a thousand visitors gathered on the campus from every quarter of the State to hear Mr. McNutt whose thesis was that democracy can not be taken for granted. He warned his audience that the enemies of democracy are always on the alert. "And the worst menace consists of those subtle forces within the body politic which are automatically in motion the moment the defenses of popular government are weakened," said Mr. McNutt. In the light of what has happened since February 24, 1940, that warning was most timely.

The visit and address of Administrator McNutt was the climax of the Semi-Centennial program, and it stands as a significant event in state history.

A music festival, featuring the musical organizations on the campus and guest artists, was produced May 5 and 6. The students of Henderson brought out this year a splendid edition of the yearbook, the *Star,* feauring the Semi-Centennial of the school. They also began in the 1939-40 academic year regular publication of a literary magazine called "The Pines." In it there appeared original stories, plays, and poetry written by Henderson students. In commemoration of the Semi-Centennial the alumni of Arkadelphia presented the college with an amplifying system for use in the auditorium. Also, as a Semi-Centennial feature, the college, through the courtesy of K. T. H. S., in Hot Springs, broadcast a program once each week throughout the latter half of the year. These programs included definitions and appreciations of current college policy, talks by faculty members on topics of timely interest and dramatic, and musical numbers by members of the Fine Arts Department. The Commencement pro-

gram, on which occasion Dr. Paul Shell Powell, president of Kentucky Wesleyan College, a graduate of Henderson, preached the Baccalaureate sermon and Governor Carl E. Bailey delivered the Commencement address, brought to a close the Semi-Centennial year.

Henderson State Teachers College is a state institution devoted to the preparation of teachers for the public schools of Arkansas. Under the authority of, and as a fully accredited member of, the North Central Association and the American Association of Teachers Colleges, it grants the standard bachelor's degree upon completion of the four-year curriculum in secondary, elementary, or primary education, or in music. It also provides special students with an opportunity to fulfill the requirements of the several one- and two-year courses for which the state grants limited teaching licenses. The college maintains that three factors are basic in the preparation of a successful teacher —a broad cultural background involving the several fields of knowledge; a thorough acquaintance with the specific subject-matter to be taught; and, finally, intensive professional training in materials, methods, and practice. Because of the breadth and scope of the work offered, Henderson serves yearly a large number of students who do not wish to qualify as teachers, but plan to enter the business world. Many students expecting to enter other professional institutions undertake preliminary work here; others avail themselves of the opportunity to secure a general education; and some come here for training in music and dramatics, for which Henderson is well known.

The successful achievement of these purposes is the ideal of the faculty, which consists of forty-two specialists in the various fields—persons experienced in public school teaching and administration. The fact that this staff has been drawn together from every section of the nation, rep-

resenting such schools as Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, Emory, Peabody, and the state universities of California, Idaho, Louisiana, Oregon, Ohio, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, and our own State University, assures the student a faculty of cosmopolitan viewpoint. The Ph. D. degree is held by the heads of the academic departments as well as by others of professorial rank. It is the task of these men and women to serve the needs of the 1,000 students who make up Henderson's yearly enrollment. Of this number the freshmen are admitted, in accordance with the act creating the college, from the high schools of Arkansas and elsewhere by certificate or by examination. Many advanced undergraduates are accepted from the state two-year schools or entered as transfers from other institutions upon presentation of a satisfactory transcript.

Candidates for degrees must complete 124 hours of college credit of satisfactory quality. Eighty per cent of these hours must be earned in residence at a school; the last thirty hours must be done at Henderson. In addition, all students are required to complete certain prescribed courses in English composition and literature, history of civilization, general psychology, health and sanitation, conservation, science, physical education, and a social science survey course. Military training is a required course for men students.

Although the curricula leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts in elementary education and in primary education are highly specialized, students pursuing courses leading to the Bachelor of Music degree may emphasize piano, violin, or vocal music, while those taking the Bachelor of Arts degree in secondary education may select any one of nine fields of concentration: English, Latin, French, History and Social Science, Mathematics, Science, Economics and Business Administration, Music, Education,

and Speech. There are also options in the related minors, one of which may be physical education. Suggested and prescribed courses of study have been set up for each of these degrees as well as for state certificate requirements.

In addition to the Fall and Spring semesters which run from September through May each year, the college conducts an annual Summer Session consisting of two terms of five weeks each. This session, from late May until early August, is conducted by the regular faculty and outstanding public school teachers and administrators, and the same courses and quality of instruction are offered in the Summer as are provided in the regular semesters. While the Summer School is planned primarily for teachers in service who wish to broaden their education or to improve their professional training, regular students often find it a means of shortening the time required to secure a degree or a teacher's license. The college also allows persons from the former group to enroll in March and earn credit in half-courses for the quarter's work.

Throughout the year, the students have a unique opportunity not available to other colleges to gain first-hand experience in actual teaching situations; for the city school system of Arkadelphia and the rural system at Friendship nearby have made their facilities available for purposes of observation, demonstration, and supervised teaching. Thus, through the cooperation of the Division of Education and the administrative forces of these systems, the cadet teacher is able to gain vital training for his future work. Those interested in primary and kindergarten work may gain needful experiences in the nursery school on the campus—a Federal Works Project for the under-privileged. To satisfy the requirements of practice teaching of commercial subjects, students are allowed to handle the non-credit courses in shorthand, typing, and

bookkeeping offered yearly under the supervision of the Department of Business Administration. Henderson is one of the few schools in the state which provides a complete four-year course in this field.

The Educational Service Bureau, which handles the administration of the student teaching set-up, functions as an agency for maintaining intimate relations between the college and the public schools of the State. The office assists the graduates and the students certified to teach in finding appropriate positions, and aids the various public school systems and organizations in planning educational programs for their periodic meetings and studies. Members of the faculty are frequent guests and speakers at school meetings, while the college has provided rooms for meetings of the Clark County Teachers Association and other groups such as the County Agents, the State Recreational Workers, conferences of agricultural workers, and Health and Safety Education Conference groups.

Men of Henderson have, for the last four years, received military training as members of an infantry unit of the Reserve Officers Training Corps, which the War Department established at this institution. The two-year Basic Course is required of all men students. The two-year Advanced Course is opened to those who have completed the basic work and who have received the recommendations of the President of the College and of the Professor of Military Science and Tactics. This advanced work includes attendance at a six-weeks Summer training camp.

To enable the student to live comfortably and happily in a pleasant environment and to enjoy wholesome and meaningful experiences while he is in school, the college maintains a Student Health Service, conducts a Personnel

Bureau, and encourages a participation in the social literary, and athletic activities of the various departments and organizations. Each student has a complete physical examination at the beginning of the academic year to determine, in general, his or her fitness for carrying a normal load of work, and, in particular, for participation in athletic or physical education activities, and in military training. Infirmary care under the supervison of a registered nurse is available for both men and women. Students absent from classes because of illness are required to go to the health department immediately. This service also includes consultation on health matters, dispensary treatment for minor ailments, and hospitalization for one week when necessary. The college urges every able-bodied student to participate in some form of physical recreation and further contemplates treatment and special activities for those who have remediable defects.

Allied with the responsibilities of the Health Service are those of the dietitian, who plans the meals, superintends the purchase and preparation of foods, and supervises the College dining hall; while the matrons of the dormitories, with the authority of the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, check on the sanitary conditions and the order maintained throughout the buildings under their care, and seek to maintain the general welfare at a high level for all students.

Although every effort is made by these agencies to care for the student's academic and personal welfare, the college is aware that the problem of the individual must be sacrificed to group standards. Young people of varying hopes, ideals, and abilities enter from widely different communities; these must be fused into a uniform student body without loss of purpose or personality in the case of each student. The Personnel Bureau functions as a com-

mittee to assist the student in adjusting himself to situations which arise in his college career. It coordinates the student activities, serves as an advisory board, interprets existing relationships between student and teacher, and maintains a system of personnel records concerning each student's attitude, physical condition, participation in activities, and his progress through the college.

Men and women students are encouraged to participate in the organized activities in the belief that such interests not only give depth and breadth to one's school career, but also serve to strengthen existing associations between individuals. The students are governed by the Student Senate, composed of the Student President and other members which are elected. In addition, each of the four classes is headed by elective officers. The students choose the Editor and Business Manager of the *Oracle,* weekly newspaper, of the *Star,* the yearbook, and of the *Pines,* the quarterly literary magazine. Other positions on the staffs of these publications are filled through appointments made by the elective officers. Students with special talents may be accepted for membership in the College Band, the College Orchestra, the String Quartet, the Choral Club, or the Varsity Debate Squad; those with specialized interests may find membership in Pi Kappa Delta (Forensic), the International Relations Club, the Science Club, the Camera Club, the Alpha Pi Omega (Dramatic), or Beta Mu Omicron (Music). The Elementary Council, the Secondary Education Club, and the Pre-Med Club serve to bring together those whose choice of vocation is similar. All women students are eligible for membership in either the Upsilon Phi or the Philomathean Literary Societies, and the Y. W. C. A.; all men may join either the Gamma Sigma or the Garland Literary Societies, and the Y. M. C. A. A chapter of Kappa Delta

Pi, Educational Honor Society, includes faculty members and students who give evidence of sound scholarship.

Perhaps the most popular of all extra-curricular student activities is the athletic program. The varsity football, basketball, tennis, and golf teams, long known throughout the state, epitomize the famed "Reddie Spirit"; but the college provides ample recreational facilities for its women, and for the men not eligible for inter-school competition. The gymnasium is equipped for volleyball, badminton, ping-pong, and shuffleboard. Students have daily access to the swimming pool, the tennis courts, and the golf course a few yards from the campus. Several intramural competitions and various tournaments in minor sports are sponsored each year by the student body.

Since Henderson became a Teachers College it has reached directly through classroom instruction thousands of young men and women of Arkansas. Indirectly through these thousands of enrollees, the College has touched the lives of many other thousands of the school children of the State. Since 1929 more than 500 persons have taken baccalaureate degrees from Henderson. As nearly as can be ascertained, more than 150 of these are now attending, or have attended, universities in pursuit of higher degrees. It is a source of pride to the College authorities that Henderson graduates and pre-professional students stand at the head of their classes in the large universities.

In conclusion, it is evident that Henderson seeks first to prepare teachers for the public schools of Arkansas; second, to give its students a mature viewpoint, a depth of understanding, and a wealth of interest beyond the utilitarian concerns of their chosen fields; and third, to sponsor such attitudes and activities as will make the individual student's personality wholesome and complete, and his associations here pleasant and ever-enduring.

Bibliography

Arkansas *Methodist,* 1889 to 1916.
Arkadelphia Methodist College Catalogs, 1891 to 1904.
Henderson-Brown Bulletins, 1911 to 1929.
Henderson College Catalogs, 1904 to 1911.
Henderson *Oracle,* 1908 to 1941.
Henderson State Teachers College Bulletins, 1929 to 1941.
Minutes of the Little Rock Conference, M. E. Church South, 1899 to 1929.
Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Henderson.
The Southern Standard, 1886 to 1910.
Riggin, J. H., *Lest We Forget,* or, *Character Gems Gleaned from South Arkansas,* Pine Bluff, Arkansas (published about 1920).

Footnotes

1. Henderson-Brown Bulletin, 1912-1913.
2. Minutes of Little Rock Conference, December 24 to 25, 1890.
3. *Southern Standard,* March 21, 1890.
4. Minutes of Little Rock Conference, December 23 to 25, 1890.
5. *Southern Standard,* June 27, 1890.
6. Catalog of Arkansas Methodist College, 1892-93.
7. *Ibid.,* 1891-92.
8. Minutes of Little Rock Conference, December, 1890.
9. *Southern Standard,* May 6, 1898.
10. *Ibid.,* September 30, 1898.
11. Henderson College Catalog, 1906-1907; and *Southern Standard,* August 22, 1912.
12. Henderson College Catalog, 1904.
13. Henderson-Brown Bulletin, 1914-15.
14. Minutes of Little Rock Conference, November, 1913.
15. *Ibid.,* December, 1892.
16. *Ibid.,* November, 1909.
17. *Ibid.,* December, 1897.
18. *Ibid.,* December, 1904.
19. Arkadelphia Methodist College Catalog, 1903-04.
20. J. H. Riggin, *Lest We Forget;* Henderson-Brown Bulletin, 1912-13.
21. Henderson-Brown Bulletin, 1914-15.
22. Minutes of the Board, February 14, 1914.
23. *Ibid.,* February 17, 1914.
24. *Ibid.,* February 17, 1914.
25. Henderson-Brown Bulletin, 1923; Minutes of Little Rock Conference, November, 1914-15.
26. Henderson-Brown Bulletin, 1923.
27. Minutes of Little Rock Conference, November, 1908.
28. Act of 1929, Sec. 1, Approved February 25, 1929.
29. *Pope's Digest,* Acts of 1929, No. 46.